ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 7/1/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED000841
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 8358
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.:

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT:
- PROPOSAL ☐
- IN-PROGRESS ☐
- FINAL ☒
- FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

4. AUTHOR(S): Miller, W. Starr and Wilson, Kenneth M.
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Faculty Development Procedures in Small Colleges: A Southern Survey
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.
8. PLACE OF ORIGIN:
ORG. Southern Regional Edu. Board
ST. 130 Sixth St., NW
CITY, STATE Atlanta, Georgia
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Southern Regional Edu. Board

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	63	133

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA:
15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

		adjustment R-05		
surveys Y-18A	retention P-41			
teachers Y-21	salaries Y-00			
recruitment P-32	development G-05			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The fifth in a series of mongraphs relating to developing and retaining good faculty in small colleges. Based on a general questionnaire distributed to all small 4-year colleges in the region and an intensive questionnaire and interview program with a selected group of colleges, the results discuss faculty size, salaries, orientation procedure, and development programs. Statistics based on the questionnaire responses appear in the appendix.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.
22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

8358

SREB RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NUMBER 5

R7- 9

Return to
A. Richards

ED000841

JUN 24 1963

Faculty Development Procedures

In Small Colleges / A SOUTHERN SURVEY

BY
W. STARR MILLER
AND
KENNETH M. WILSON

8358

SREB RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NUMBER 5

Faculty Development Procedures

In Small Colleges / A SOUTHERN SURVEY

by W. STARR MILLER and KENNETH M. WILSON

**SOUTHERN REGIONAL
EDUCATION BOARD**
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta 13, Georgia
1963

This study was financed in part by funds made available through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

Foreword

The heart of any college is its faculty. A college is good or bad, effective or non-effective, because of the kind of faculty it has.

The Southern Regional Education Board for a number of years has given special attention to questions associated with the development and retention of good faculty. Among the published results are *Preparing College Teachers* by A. D. Albright and John Barrows (1959), the *Career Decisions of College Teachers* by John W. Gustad (1960), and a series of comprehensive bibliographies on *College Teachers and College Teaching* by Walter Crosby Eells (1957, 1959 and 1962). The Board is pleased to add to this series of publications this report on *Faculty Development Procedures in Small Colleges.*

As the authors suggest in their opening chapter, the problems of recruiting additional people into college teaching, important as they are, must not be allowed to overshadow the equal importance of helping existing faculty become better teachers *and* scholars. This survey of faculty development procedures in small, liberal arts colleges of the South indicates that something already is being done to develop these resources, but that a good deal more *might* be done. While small colleges face special problems of finding new teachers, they share with all institutions some common problems of faculty development. This study, therefore, should be of interest to all institutions.

WINFRED L. GODWIN, *Director*
Southern Regional Education Board

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Advisory Committee

Lucile Allen
Dean of Women
Stanford University
Stanford, California
(formerly, Educational Consultant,
Austin College)

Harold A. Haswell
Director
Higher Education Programs Branch
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Lewis B. Mayhew
Professor of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California
(formerly, Director of Institutional
Research, University of South Florida)

Louis Smith
Dean
Berea College
Berea, Kentucky

Judson C. Ward, Jr.
Vice President, and
Dean of Faculties
Emory University
Atlanta 22, Georgia

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Acknowledgements

This survey, conducted under the auspices of the Southern Regional Education Board and supported, in part, by funds available through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation was made possible by the cooperation of many individuals, institutions, and agencies. The study received the full and enthusiastic support of deans and other administrative officers in essentially all of the "small" colleges of the South. Without the cooperation of these individuals the study would not have been possible. So, to the large number of individuals who completed questionnaires, and the college presidents, deans, and faculty members who cheerfully granted personal interviews during the course of the study, a special word of thanks.

Indebtedness to many others is also gratefully acknowledged:

To members of the advisory committee for the study—Lucile Allen, Harold Haswell, Lewis B. Mayhew, Louis Smith, and Judson C. Ward, Jr.—for encouragement and helpful advice during the formative stages of the project, critical reading of the preliminary manuscript, and constructive suggestions; to John K. Folger, Dean of the Graduate School, Florida State University (formerly, Associate Director for Research, SREB) for recognizing the need for the project and for assistance and advice during the course of the study; and, to several intrepid educators for rating many of the colleges involved in this study in terms of "strength and reputation for the accomplishment of educational purpose"— on the promise of anonymity;

To James L. Miller, Jr., Associate Director for Research, and E. F. Schietinger, Research Associate, SREB; Robert L. Sutherland, Director, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health; Paul Carroll, Dean, and Harold Johnson, Associate Professor of Education, Georgia Southern College; James Sims, Chairman, Department of English, Austin Peay College; and, Edward Foster, Professor of English, Georgia Institute of Technology, for critical reading of the preliminary manuscript and helpful suggestions;

To Miss Elaine Bogue, Research Assistant, SREB, for assistance in data analysis, and to Mrs. Ruth Smith, Administrative Assistant, SREB, for supervision of much of the secretarial work associated with the project; and

To various publishers for permission to quote from certain of the publications cited in this report.

While all of these have contributed greatly to the study, they should not be held accountable for the ideas expressed nor should they be charged with responsibility for any of its shortcomings.

Kenneth M. Wilson Research Associate Southern Regional Education Board Atlanta, Georgia	W. Starr Miller Chairman, Education Division Georgia Southern College Statesboro, Georgia (formerly Dean, Tift College)

Table of Contents

Foreword iii

Acknowledgments vii

Chapters

I Need and Opportunity for Faculty Development in the Small College 1

II Study Design and Procedures 7

III Overview of Faculty Development Procedures 13

IV Helping Faculty Members Fit In and Advance the Purposes of the Institution 31

V Stimulating Professional Growth and the Development of Teaching Effectiveness 41

VI Helping Faculty Members Maintain a Sense of Security and Morale 57

VII Reflections and Impressions 69

Appendixes

A Description of Faculty Development Procedures in Selected Colleges 83

B Statistical Supplement 113

C Information Regarding the Sample and Study Procedures 123

CHAPTER I

Need and Opportunity for Faculty Development In the Small College

PRESSURES generated by current and prospective shortages of college faculty members have focused attention on a variety of problems related to the recruitment, professional preparation, and retention of such personnel. Much attention has been given, for example, to the problem of how to attract more young men and young women into the field of college teaching generally, into selected teaching fields, or into employment in various types of institutions. There have been extensive discussions of problems related to the improvement of programs of graduate study for prospective teachers, which need no elaboration for those who have been close to colleges and universities in the years since World War II.

Concentration on these problems, important as they are, has tended to overshadow and obscure a related, equally important, and perennial problem in higher education, namely that of promoting the continuous professional development of *available* faculty members within the context of their employment. Current lack of attention to this problem may be due in part to the greater immediate concern for *staffing* colleges and universities. However, the very fact that shortages of qualified faculty members either exist or are in prospect gives added emphasis and urgency to the need for finding "solutions" to the problem of how colleges and universities can best utilize, conserve, and increase the effectiveness and the productivity of available faculty resources, both new and old. Moreover, without regard to the need for making the most of a scarce resource, it is a matter of obvious concern that conditions conducive to the continuous professional growth and development of college teachers be fostered on every campus since under any set of circumstances the quality of education that students receive will be influenced by the quality of college faculties.

The need for careful cultivation of faculty resources is not restricted to any one type or class of institution—large or small, affluent or impoverished, prestigious or obscure; it is not unique to institutions in any one region of the country; and, it does not derive from, but is only heightened by, conditions of "scarcity." However, small, liberal arts colleges of the South[1], some of whose practices and procedures in this area are examined in this report, have a special need and a special challenge to identify and take active steps to establish and maintain institutional conditions conducive to maximum development of available faculty resources.

Factors Affecting Need for Faculty Development in Small Colleges

Recent estimates indicate that the Southern region may need 45,000 additional college teachers by 1970 to meet projected increases in enrollments and to provide replacements in faculty for vacancies occurring through retirements and death.[2] Yet it is estimated that only about 15,000 Ph.D.'s will be graduated in the region during the present decade and at least half of these are expected to go into industry or government rather than into college or university positions.

Scarcity of fully qualified faculty members increases the intercollege mobility of personnel, putting the South in the national professional market as other regions attract faculty members by higher salaries and other benefits.[3] While this is a factor which affects all institutions in the region to some extent, smaller colleges of the South face a particularly critical problem in holding their faculty members, since they are in a relatively unfavorable competitive position in terms of salaries and benefits not only *inter-* but also *intra*-regionally. Faculty members who wish to leave smaller, often less affluent institutions for higher salaries can be attracted to higher-salaried positions in Southern universities as well as to colleges or universities outside the region.

---

[1] For purposes of this study, a "small" college is defined as one enrolling fewer than 2,000 students. The "South" is defined as the sixteen states which are parties to the Southern Regional Education Board Compact; namely, Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

[2] Southern Regional Education Board, *Statistics for the Sixties* (Atlanta, Georgia: The Board, 1963).

[3] For data on the salary gap between the South and the nation, see Southern Regional Education Board, *ibid.*

The difficulties in attracting and retaining an adequate *number* of faculty members are complicated by those involved in maintaining high *quality* of faculty. There is, in general, a nation-wide increase in the percentage of new faculty members with less than the doctorate degree, and some observers of graduate education argue that traditional doctoral programs, with essentially exclusive emphasis on development of research competence, are not most adequately designed to prepare individuals for the multiple roles of college teaching.[4]

Compounding the problem for smaller colleges is the fact that their emphasis on the *teaching* function sets a stage for potential conflict with what has been termed the "current and dominant pattern of professional success in American higher education, [namely] the Big-University pattern [which is characterized by] light teaching loads, advanced subject-matter and students, and emphasis upon research and a preoccupation with the establishment of professional reputation through publication."[5] Attitudes, expectations, and behavior associated with the "big-university" syndrome constitute potential barriers to securing, motivating, and retaining faculty personnel for smaller institutions which do not have graduate programs and elaborate research facilities.

Related to the foregoing is the much-discussed fact, mentioned earlier, that college teachers typically enter their profession with little special "pre-service" preparation for the assumption of faculty responsibilities, including classroom teaching, and many fail to develop identification with teaching or with the institution after joining a college faculty, as several recent studies have suggested.[6] These circumstances have implications for all institutions; the most general of which is that some responsibility for orienting and "instructing" the newly inducted practitioner of the teaching profession must be assumed by the employing institution. It may be argued that for an institution which *stresses* the teaching function this responsibility becomes a crucial one, and many contend that the small, undergraduate liberal arts college is the one gem that still holds the true gleam of emphasis on teaching.

---

[4] National Education Association, "Are New College Teachers Prepared?", *NEA Research Bulletin,* October 1959, p. 87.

[5] Harold W. Stoke, "Some Problems of Faculty Development," in *Faculty Utilization and Retention* (Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960).

[6] See, for example, the following:

A. D. Albright and John Barrows, *Preparing College Teachers* (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Board, 1959).

John W. Gustad, *The Career Decisions of College Teachers* (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960).

Earl J. McGrath, *The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Arts* (N. Y.: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1959).

Challenge and Opportunity

College administrators, as Gustad has suggested, "have a primary responsibility [not only] to assemble the best possible faculty [but also] to provide conditions under which this faculty can and will work to utmost advantage."[7] Administrators of small colleges are faced with special problems in getting maximally qualified faculty members and have an especially urgent need to provide a campus climate and a set of conditions under which the faculty "can and will work to utmost advantage," and which are conducive to the development and improvement of the faculty members they do get, both new and old.

In essence, small colleges are especially challenged by their circumstances to provide opportunity and incentive for in-service growth and improvement of the faculty in teaching effectiveness; to elicit faculty understanding of and support for institutional objectives; and to develop personnel policies and conditions of work conducive to faculty adjustment, morale, security, and productivity.

This is no small challenge. Fortunately, however, small, liberal arts colleges have a unique opportunity to develop meaningful approaches to faculty development, in the sense mentioned above. This opportunity derives in part from the advantage such institutions have in their potential for developing a genuine community of interests around a clearly defined set of institutional objectives. By virtue of their very smallness and the strength and viability of the liberal arts concept, such colleges afford both faculty and administration an opportunity to work together in the task of developing a coherent, mutually acceptable, and clearly enunciated set of institutional objectives and the related task of creating a total college environment which supports these objectives.

It goes without saying, however, that college administrators should not rely on "togetherness" to create and nourish such a desirable context for faculty growth and development. They must exercise vigorous leadership if the unique opportunity is to be realized. The general purpose of this essentially normative study has been to ascertain what small colleges are doing to meet the challenge of faculty development, as reflected by the presence of relevant, administratively-supported practices and institutional provisions. In more specific terms, the objectives of the study have been as follows:

---

[7] John W. Gustad, "An Ancient and Honorable Profession," *AAUP Bulletin*, September 1962, pp. 261-265.

1. To ascertain the general structural characteristics of current institutional approaches to the orientation and in-service development of the faculty;
2. To determine the prevalence of, and the value judgments of administrators and faculty members regarding, selected provisions or practices affecting, or thought to affect, the adjustment, productivity, and morale of the faculty;
3. To provide descriptions of particularly interesting institutional practices and approaches.

Although the orientation of the study is largely normative and its primary emphasis on relatively specific administratively-supported practices or provisions, it is recognized that there are no universally applicable "methods," "techniques," or "formulas" for the attainment of such goals as the improvement of teaching effectiveness, increased faculty morale, increased support of the faculty for institutional objectives, etc., just as there are none for the attainment of other equally significant goals of college administration. Indeed, problems of faculty development are part of (and are no more amenable to standardized solution than) the problem of *institutional development*. It is assumed, in fact, that progress in faculty development is contingent upon serious and continuous efforts at, for example (a) defining, elaborating, evaluating, and communicating institutional objectives, (b) developing a curricular program logically organized to implement these objectives, (c) developing methods of student recruitment, selection, and guidance which are consistent with these objectives, and (d) increasing the sources of financial support for all aspects of institutional operation, both academic and nonacademic.

It should also be stated at the outset that emphasis in this survey on the *in-service* aspects of the process of faculty development—*i.e.*, on what institutions are doing to provide conditions under which *available* faculty members "can and will work to advantage"—is in no way intended to discount the importance of vigorous efforts at recruitment of the best possible "raw material." It is recognized that for certain colleges the only real solution for problems of institutional development and faculty development lies in a rapid and large-scale infusion of *new* resources, both human and economic. The problems of such institutions are drastically different from those of colleges with established reputations and sound fiscal positions and it cannot be expected that institutions differing markedly in circumstances will either perceive or treat problems of "faculty development" in the same way. It is a basic assumption of the study, however, that despite the diversity which obtains among "small" colleges, concern for the cultivation of available resources should be common to all.

CHAPTER II

Study Design and Procedures

THIS STUDY was designed to ascertain what small colleges of the Southern region are doing to promote faculty orientation and in-service development (growth, improvement) as reflected by the presence of selected institutional provisions, practices, or policies (collectively, *procedures* for faculty development) designed to (a) help orient new faculty members to the institution and encourage the identification of faculty members, new and old, with institutional problems and purposes, (b) provide incentive and opportunity for improvement of faculty members in teaching effectiveness and for professional growth generally, and (c) contribute to faculty security and morale.

In addition to information regarding the prevalence of certain procedures, the study was also designed to obtain administrative and faculty judgments regarding the value of procedures and information regarding the general structural characteristics of current institutional approaches to faculty development—e.g., degree of formality, locus or loci of administrative responsibility, etc.

Information pertinent to these general objectives was obtained through (a) a general questionnaire survey encompassing essentially all small four-year colleges of the region, and (b) a more intensive inquiry involving questionnaires and/or interviews with administrators and faculty members in a selected group of colleges.[1] Procedures in developing and distributing questionnaires, in conducting institutional visits and interviews, and in analyzing and presenting the data of the study are described in this chapter.

Developing and Distributing the Basic Questionnaire

One of the first tasks of the study was that of planning a basic questionnaire designed to elicit information from college administrators regarding the use and judged value of certain provisions and practices, institutional characteristics thought to be relevant to the interpretation of findings (e.g., size of faculty, faculty turnover, salary schedules, etc.), and institutional emphases and problems in the area of faculty development. The decision to structure the survey by specifying particular practices and provisions rather than make a more open ended inquiry regarding "faculty development" was dictated by the fact that the concepts of "faculty development" are varied. In fact, the area does not appear to have been systematically delimited either by virtue of institutional practice or in the literature. As a consequence of this lack of systematic delimitation some operational definition was thought to be necessary for meaningful communication, and that operational definition was provided by the procedures selected for inclusion in the questionnaire.

A review of the literature led to the identification of a large number of relatively specific practices, conditions of work, or personnel policies which have been considered important in efforts to orient faculty members to the institution, to improve instruction, or to promote morale within the faculty. The provisions and practices included on the faculty-development questionnaire were selected from those identified in the literature review in terms of their judged relevance to the concerns of the study.[2]

A total of thirty-three provisions or practices (see Parts II and III of the basic questionnaire, Exhibit C-2, Appendix C) was selected so as to give representation to each of the three major, interrelated areas projected for examination, *viz.* orientation, teaching effectiveness and professional growth, and morale. These practices and provisions should not be thought of as constituting either a model or an exhaustive set of procedures for inclusion in a program of development. They do comprise, however, a representative sampling of those frequently recommended or cited in discussions of problems of faculty orientation, problems of improving instruction, and the like, which may be thought of as aspects of the general problem of "faculty development."

---

[1] Questionnaires were planned and developed by W. Starr Miller who also planned and conducted all interviews during the course of the study.

[2] Of particular value in the identification of relevant provisions and practices were the following sources:

C. S. Williams, "Improvement of College Teachers" (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1949).

John S. Diekhoff, *Report of the College Faculty Internship Program: Tomorrow's Professors* (New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1959).

Fred J. Kelly (Editor), *Improving College Instruction* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1951).

John W. Gustad (Editor), *Faculty Preparation and Orientation* (Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960).

Items pertaining to specific recruitment practices, instructional practices, general practices with respect to salaries and fringe benefits, and other related factors which may directly or indirectly affect faculty adjustment, productivity, and morale were not included in the questionnaire.

Distributing the Basic Questionnaire

Using information published by the United States Office of Education, all four-year colleges of less than 2000 enrollment (1959-60), located in the sixteen states comprising the Southern Regional Education Board Compact area were identified.[3] All colleges with programs limited specifically to professional, technical, teacher, or terminal education were eliminated. Through this procedure, 228 "small" colleges were identified for inclusion in the general survey. The basic questionnaire was mailed in the fall of 1960 to the dean of the college in each of the 228 institutions. A total of 214 completed questionnaires was returned, representing a response rate of 93.9 per cent. A detailed breakdown of the distribution of questionnaires and the number of returns by control of institution and by state are shown in Appendix C, Exhibit C-1.

From the completed questionnaires, it was possible to determine whether or not given procedures were in use at a particular college, the opinion of respondents regarding the value of the procedures being employed in their respective institutions, and other items of information about the responding institutions.

A Closer Look

Data provided by the basic questionnaires were supplemented by additional information obtained from 59 of the 214 responding colleges: 39 colleges completed more detailed questionnaires ("depth" questionnaires) bearing on specific practices or provisions which they reported and at 20 other colleges interviews were conducted with administrators and selected faculty members.[4]

---

[3] U. S. Office of Education, "Higher Education," *Education Directory, Part 3,* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959).

The 59 institutions were selected on the basis of a relatively subjective evaluation of information provided in the basic questionnaire, related materials (e.g., brochures) forwarded by respondents, and other sources of information about the colleges of the region. Typically, however, institutions selected were those which reported provisions or practices *judged to be of value locally* by the respondent. Selection was guided, in addition, by reference to several objective criteria, including number and type of practices and provisions reported, average salary paid full professors, and percentage of the faculty with doctorate degrees. An effort was made to avoid selection of colleges which were *low* on all these variables under the assumption that institutions with few procedures in use and with relatively limited resources would not be highly fruitful sources of relevant information and insights.

The depth questionnaires and interviews provided additional perspective and additional detail regarding institutional practices and provisions for orientation and development of the faculty. In the case of the depth questionnaires, each institution reporting a given practice as being of value was asked to provide information regarding it (e.g., those reporting a "pre-college workshop" were asked to indicate its duration, nature of topics covered, etc.). Illustrative items may be seen in Exhibit C-7, Appendix C.

At each of the twenty campuses visited, interviews were requested with two new faculty members, two who had been with the college up to three years, and two who had been with the college five to ten years. Deans were asked to identify faculty members for the interview so as to give representation to (a) those teaching some courses open to all undergraduates and (b) the various major disciplinary groupings.[5]

In the twenty institutions, interviews ranging in duration from about 45 minutes to more than one hour were conducted with 147 persons: 16 presidents, 20 deans, 111 faculty members, with characteristics as described in Exhibit C-4, Appendix C. Thirty-six of the interviews were somewhat informal, but all interviews touched upon similar questions. Interviews provided a basis for eliciting faculty reactions to the procedures in effect on the respective campuses. In addition, they provided insight into administrative concepts of "faculty development," the degree to which clearly defined goals and objectives had been formulated, and the philosophy of the administration in respect to this area.[6]

---

[4] For a listing of the 39 colleges providing information via "depth" questionnaires, see Exhibit C-6, Appendix C and for the 20 colleges at which interviews were conducted, see Exhibit C-3, Appendix C.

[5] It was recognized that administrative selection of the interview sample might introduce some bias (e.g., selection of faculty members with a record of cooperation with the administration, with atypical attitudes toward their disciplinary affiliations, etc.) but the risk of significant distortion of results was considered relatively slight.

Analyzing the Data

As indicated at the outset, the survey was thought of as essentially normative or descriptive in character. Formal procedures for assessing the validity of current practice were not incorporated in the design of the study and no special problems of analysis were encountered. In analyzing the basic data, however, an effort was made to provide a frame of reference for relating use of procedures to some index of the "relative strength" of various colleges.

The Index of Reputational Strength

While use of any method for "measuring" the "strength" or "excellence" of higher institutions is fraught with peril, there is substantial evidence that certain institutional characteristics such as, for example, the percentage of faculty with the doctorate degree, financial status, and library size are associated with judgments of institutional strength. Eells,[7] for example, found that average salary and percentage of faculty with the doctorate were variables often given much weight in the formation of an estimate about the strength of an institution and North Central Association studies[8] have revealed that percentage of faculty with the doctorate degree and salaries paid have a positive relationship to "educational excellence" of an institution as determined by subjective rating devices and standardized test performance of students.[9]

---

[6] Generally speaking, the frame of reference within which interviews were conducted is reflected in the set of questions shown as Exhibit C-5, Appendix C.

[7] Walter Crosby Eells, "Highest Earned Degrees of Faculty Members in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States, 1954-55," *College and University*, Vol. 34, No. 1, Fall 1958.

[8] See, for example, Melvin E. Haggerty, *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions, Vol. II: The Faculty* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937).

[9] In a recently reported factor analysis of 33 institutional characteristics, on the factor accounting for the highest proportion of the total variation, "percentage of the faculty holding doctorates," "operating budget," "aptitude level of student body," "intellectual orientation" were all marked by high positive loadings, consistent with other evidence cited. See Alexander W. Astin, "An Empirical Characterization of Higher Educational Institutions," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 53, 1962, 224-235.

In order to construct a useful measure, it was decided to employ these two objective measures (average salary for full-professors and percentage of faculty with the doctorate) in combination with a more subjective estimate of institutional "strength and reputation for the accomplishment of educational purpose." In obtaining the latter measure, eight educators familiar with a substantial proportion of the institutions of the region were asked to rate institutions. Ratings were obtained for 149 of the 214 responding colleges and after conversion to numerical terms, they were combined with the two objective measures to form a composite score, called the *Index of Reputational Strength (IRS)*.[10] The IRS provided a systematic basis for analyzing use of procedures in relation to institutional strength.

Presentation of Findings

In the following chapters, attention is given first to the general characteristics of approaches to faculty development in the region, the extent of use and judged value of designated provisions and practices, and institutional characteristics affecting use of practices. Following the overview chapter, the procedures examined in this study are treated as they relate to the three previously mentioned interrelated concerns of development namely, orientation, teaching effectiveness and professional growth, and morale and security. A final chapter is given over to the consideration of basic impressions and observations about the state of approaches to faculty development in small colleges of the region and needed action and research.

Descriptions of approaches to faculty development in selected colleges are provided in Appendix A. These descriptions are intended to point up interesting institutional "programs" for faculty development.

---

[10] The three moderately intercorrelated measures were given equal weighting in the composite by the method of equating standard deviations.

CHAPTER III

Overview of Faculty Development Procedures

SOME INDICATION of the extent to which the problems under consideration in this study are recognized as important by administrators of the small colleges of the region is given by the fact that completed questionnaires were returned by almost 94 per cent of the sample. As a consequence of this unusually high response rate, the information available through the basic questionnaire about the use of provisions and practices selected for study and their judged value, institutional factors bearing on development, and other relevant items represents essentially full coverage of the small colleges of the region.

In this chapter, findings from the basic questionnaire survey are presented in combination with certain findings and impressions gained from interviews with administrators and faculty members, in order to provide a general overview of institutional efforts at faculty orientation and in-service development.[1]

Context and Perspective

Some 94 per cent of the four-year, liberal arts colleges of under 2000 enrollment in the Southern region are represented in the general questionnaire survey. The majority of these colleges are privately controlled—60.3 per cent are church-related, 16.4 are independent private institutions, and only 23.4 per cent are public.

---

[1] More detailed tabular presentation of certain findings alluded to in this chapter may be examined in Appendix B, "Statistical Supplement."

As a group, these colleges are characterized by a mean enrollment of about 816 students, but the range is great—from less than 250 to roughly 2000—and the "largest" institution enrolls almost nine times as many students as the "smallest." They employed, on the average, about 59 faculty members during the academic year 1960-61, but roughly one-tenth of the colleges employed more than 90 faculty members and a slightly smaller proportion employed fewer than 30.

The average number of faculty members leaving these colleges for other positions during the academic year 1959-60 was approximately six, representing an average loss of some 10.7 per cent. A few institutions lost no faculty members, but for others the number leaving represented more than one fourth of the total faculty. Of those leaving, about 42 per cent are reported to have gone to "other college positions,"[2] and, in the judgment of respondents, a majority of these faculty members went to positions representing definite professional advancement.

All institutions inducted at least one new faculty member during the academic year 1960-61 and some hired more than 25, with the mean for all institutions being roughly nine. Thus, a majority of these colleges showed some gain in faculty size over 1959-60 although this was not universally true.

In the "typical" institution, some 30 per cent of the faculty members hold an earned doctorate degree but there is great variation around this typical value—percentages ranged from less than 20 to more than 70. Average nine-month salary reported for full professors ranged from about $4,700 to some $10,000, with the mean for the group being $6,650—substantially less than the average for liberal arts colleges nationally and markedly less than the comparable average for universities, regionally or nationally. As might be expected, these two variables are related. Colleges with higher salaries for full professors tend to have proportionately more faculty members with the doctorate degree than colleges with lower salary schedules (see Exhibit B-3, Appendix B). Moreover, both these factors (salary level and proportion of doctorates) were found to be related to independently obtained subjective ratings of institutional "strength and reputation for the accomplishment of educational purpose" provided for 149 of the 214 responding colleges by a panel of eight educators having wide acquaintance with the colleges of the region.[5]

---

[2] In view of the possibility that some respondents may have interpreted this phrase narrowly—e.g., excluding those taking university positions—the figure reported may be an underestimate of the percentage of retention in higher education of faculty members leaving positions in these small colleges during the year in question.

It is clear from the foregoing that the colleges under consideration in this study constitute a homogeneous group with respect to *definitional* criteria only! They are characterized by great diversity, differing significantly in size of faculty and student body, financial resources as reflected in current salary schedules, level of formal educational attainment of faculty, and rate of faculty turnover. And, finally, they differ also in the reputations which they have established for overall strength of program and accomplishment of purpose.

Administrative Responsibility and Major Emphases

Judging from the responses received, responsibility for the area of "faculty development" (as reflected by the practices and provisions included on the questionnaire) is seldom in the hands of only one individual—some 82 per cent of the respondents, 88.5 per cent of whom were deans, listed one or more individuals, in addition to themselves, having some responsibilities in this area. In more than one-half of the institutions the president shares responsibility, and in a similar proportion, departmental chairmen were listed.

It seems clear, however, that the dean of the college is the one administrative officer most universally responsible for leadership in the area of faculty development, approaches to which tend to be informal rather than formal. Almost nine-tenths of the respondents indicated that approaches to the continued development of faculty members after their induction were predominantly informal and approaches to the induction of new faculty members were similarly characterized.

It is of interest to note that almost two-fifths of the colleges are reported as placing *less* emphasis (as reflected in staff time and effort) on "orienting [faculty members] to their jobs and the institutions after they [are hired]" than on "searching for and recruiting new faculty members." A somewhat larger group of institutions (45.2 per cent) are reported as placing about equal emphasis on both these areas, while only about one-sixth (15.9 per cent) indicate more emphasis on orientation than on recruitment.

---

[5] Each member of the panel was asked to rate each college with which he was acquainted as "high," "average," or "low" with respect to "strength and reputation for the accomplishment of educational purpose." All available ratings for each institution were assigned numerical values and averaged. In the group of 149 institutions for which ratings were available, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient obtained for ratings *versus* average salary was .53, and for ratings *versus* proportion of doctorates, .55.

That so many of these small colleges are at least as much concerned with recruitment of faculty members as with the subsequent orientation of these faculty members to their jobs and the institutional context of their employment, should not, of course, be construed as indicative of any lack of concern for the latter area. An institution cannot "orient" or "develop" faculty members which it does not have. Moreover, and perhaps equally obvious, the success of any effort at faculty development is likely to be greatly enhanced by the availability of "good material." And, finally, the concept of recruitment is much more straightforward than that of "development"—all institutions understand clearly the implications of the success or failure of a recruitment program, but most are not accustomed to considering the success or failure of a program designed to facilitate the continued growth and development of faculty members after they are recruited, a process which is not very clearly understood and which is often taken for granted.

Use and Rated Value of Selected Practices

Thirty-three items reflecting types of provisions which institutions might make for faculty development were included on the questionnaire. Eleven of these items pertained to relatively general areas of concern and 22 specified particular practices judged to be relevant to the area of faculty development.

Shown in Table 1 are the 11 types of provisions included on the questionnaire, listed in descending order with respect to *administrators' ratings of importance*. The percentage of institutions at which attempts to "do something about" each of these provisions are reported, and the percentage of respondents assigning designated levels of importance to each may be seen in the table.[4]

Six of the 11 types of provisions were judged to be "among the most important which an institution could provide" in the area of faculty development by more than two-thirds of respondents reporting them.

It is evident that provisions for informing faculty members about the institution, for arousing sympathetic concern about institutional aims, assuring a climate of freedom, stimulating a flow of creative ideas for institutional improvement, giving personal assistance to first-year faculty members with teaching problems, and faculty evaluation of faculty development programs are thought to be quite im-

---

[4] In this and other tables throughout the report, base for percentages, in the case of ratings of value or importance, is the number of respondents *reporting a practice or provision* at their institutions, not the total number of respondents to the questionnaire.

TABLE 1

Incidence and Judged Importance of Designated Types of Provisions By Administrators

Nature or purpose of provision(s)	Colleges reporting provisions	*Ratings of importance** Among the most important	*Ratings of importance** Not very important
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Giving new faculty members information about the total institution, its aims, policies, and regulations	89.5	86.1	0.5
Helping the new faculty member to become sympathetic with and concerned about the aims and purposes of the college	74.2	85.8	0.0
Assuring faculty members of freedom on thought, action, and expression	70.3	80.3	2.0
Stimulating the flow of creative ideas and suggestions for improvement of the college	63.6	75.9	1.5
Giving first-year faculty members continuing personal assistance with teaching problems	57.9	72.7	0.0
Having periodic faculty evaluation of the program for faculty development	38.8	67.9	1.2
Giving new faculty members information about the characteristics of fellow faculty members and the student body	36.8	48.1	2.6
Making available non-professional aides and assistance for routines related to teaching	59.8	35.2	4.8
Having social activities for introducing new members	82.3	29.7	6.4
Giving the new faculty member information about the community	44.0	28.3	3.3
Giving orientation to wives of new faculty members	26.8	14.3	7.1

*Percentage *of those reporting each provision* is given. Ratings of "fairly important" not shown.

portant by a substantial majority of respondents who reported such provisions at their institutions. However, whereas almost 90 per cent of the small colleges are attempting to provide relevant information to new faculty members, only slightly more than one-third of these institutions (38.8 per cent) report that they attempt to provide for faculty evaluation of the program for faculty development.

Lower on the scale of rated importance are provisions for giving new faculty members information about characteristics of colleagues and the student body, for making available teaching aides and assistants, for introductory social activities, for giving information about the community, and for orienting new faculty wives.

While there is considerable variation in use and judged importance of these provisions, respondents were definitely inclined to rate all provisions as *at least* "fairly important"—in no instance did as many as 10 per cent use the category "not very important."

Shown in Table 2 are data indicating the use and rated value of the 22 specific practices included on the questionnaire. As in the case of the provisions previously reported, only the ratings of administrators who indicated that their institutions employed a particular practice are involved in the assessment of "value." The "value index" shown is based on the following scale: ratings of "among the most valuable" were assigned a score of 5; those of "valuable," a weight of 3; and ratings of "limited value" were assigned a score of 1. Practices are listed in descending order with respect to rated value among "users."

It may be seen that ten of the 22 practices were reported by more than one half of the institutions. The two practices most frequently reported were *financial assistance for attendance at professional meetings* and *scheduled conferences in some departments for consideration of teaching problems,* each of which was reported by about three-fourths of the colleges. Each of the following practices was reported by between 60 and 70 percent of the institutions:

Organized and periodic faculty self-study of the college,
Financial assistance for further graduate study,
Pre-college workshops for all faculty members,
Private offices for all faculty members,
Faculty handbook,
Orientation sessions for new faculty members, and
Special collection of library materials on higher education.

With the exception of the last-mentioned practice, which was below average in terms of rated value, *the more frequently reported prac-*

TABLE 2

Incidence of Selected Practices and Administrators' Ratings of Their Value for Faculty Development

Practice	Rated value of practice*		Per cent using practice
	Value Index	Per cent rating "Among Most Valuable"	
Sabbatical leaves at half salary or more	3.9	56.7	32.1
Financial assistance for graduate study	3.9	53.0	64.1
Periodic faculty self-study of the college	3.9	50.7	67.9
Pre-college workshop for all faculty	3.8	43.2	63.2
Private offices for all faculty	3.6	36.0	59.8
Faculty handbook	3.5	35.8	65.6
Financial assistance for attendance at professional meetings	3.5	30.9	77.5
Orientation sessions for new faculty	3.5	30.0	67.0
Departmental conferences on teaching	3.4	33.8	75.1
Assignment of experienced teacher to work with first-year teacher	3.4	27.9	32.5
Active faculty committee on instruction	3.3	31.3	39.7
Salary schedule showing opportunities for advancement	3.3	29.4	52.2
Faculty discussions of college teaching	3.1	23.3	43.1
Functioning teacher exchange	3.0	25.0	3.8
Visiting lecturers on higher education	3.0	23.3	34.9
Load adjustment for research and writing	3.0	21.1	43.1
Less than normal load for first-year teachers	2.8	14.0	20.6
Load adjustment for off-campus consulting	2.8	13.5	17.7
Systematic visitation of classes	2.7	12.9	14.8
Load adjustment for committee work	2.7	6.2	30.6
Funds for publication of faculty research	2.5	9.1	15.8
Library materials on higher education	2.5	8.2	64.1

*Only those reporting given practices are involved in ratings. Value index is on the following scale: "among most valuable" = 5; "valuable" = 3; "limited value" = 1. Practices are listed in descending order with regard to the value index.

tices enumerated above constitute, in the judgment of the administrators employing them, a cluster of highly valuable practices from the point of view of faculty development.

Although reported by less than one-third of the colleges. *the sabbatical leave at half salary or more* was rated as "among the most valuable" practices for faculty development by 56.7 per cent of those reporting its use, leading all other practices in this respect. Other practices low in frequency of use but with average or higher ratings of value are the following:

- **Assignment of an experienced teacher to work with a first-year teacher on teaching problems,**
- **Distribution of a salary schedule which clearly shows opportunities for advancement,**
- **Active faculty committee on the improvement of instruction,**
- **Organized faculty discussions of college teaching,**
- **Series of visiting lecturers on higher education, and**
- **Adjustment of teaching load to allow time for research and writing.**

All the practices just enumerated received at least as many high ratings as low ratings with value indices ranging from 3.0 to 3.4.

The modal rating for all remaining practices was "valuable"—in all instances more than 60 per cent of the ratings were either "valuable" or "most valuable." However, in contrast to the practices enumerated above, they received *fewer* high (i.e., "most valuable") ratings than low (i.e., of "limited value"). The remaining practices, listed below, are infrequently used—none by as many as one third of the colleges:

- **Systematic visitation of classes for the improvement of teaching,**
- **Load adjustment for committee work,**
- **Load adjustment for off-campus consulting or lecturing,**
- **Funds for publication of faculty research, and**
- **Allowing first-year teachers to carry less than a normal teaching load.**

The *infrequently reported* practices tend to (a) be relatively expensive (e.g., sabbatical leaves, funds for publication), (b) require formal reduction in faculty *teaching load,* or (c) involve faculty members in *non-teaching* activities with or without reduction in load.

Faculty Ratings of Practices

It is of interest to compare the judgments of administrators, just reviewed, with those obtained through interviews, at 20 institutions, with 111 faculty members. At each institution where the dean reported a given practice, faculty members interviewed were asked to rate the practice in the same set of terms as that involved for deans. By assigning numerical values to their ratings of each practice it was possible to derive a composite rating representing the pooled judgment of the faculty members interviewed at each institution. From the point of view of the faculty members interviewed, the following practices were among the highest ranking in rated value:

Sabbatical leaves at half salary or more,
Private offices for all faculty,
Financial assistance for attendance at professional meetings,
Adjustment in load for research and writing,
Financial assistance for further graduate study, and
Less than normal load for first-year faculty members.

Among the practices ranking lowest in rated value—though typically rated as of more than limited value by the majority of individuals concerned—were the following:

Faculty handbook,
Collection of library materials on higher education,
Pre-college workshop for all faculty members,
Active faculty committee charged with improving instruction,
Visiting lecturers on higher education, and
Orientation sessions for new faculty members.

Faculty members and administrators agree that the practices included on the questionnaire are worthwhile. However, several practices ranking highest among the total of twenty-two in terms of deans' ratings of value occupy relatively low rank based on faculty composite ratings, including, for example, such practices as *use of a faculty handbook, pre-college workshop for all faculty members,* and *orientation sessions for new faculty*. Relatively low-ranked by deans, but high in terms of *faculty* rankings were such practices as *adjustment in load for research and writing* and *less than normal load for first-year faculty members.*

Thus, while faculty members and administrators tend to think of practices generally as being worthwhile, it must be recognized that there are significant differences in the perceived value and importance of practices, as between these two groups, and that these differences have implications for faculty development.[5]

Selected Institutional Variables Affecting Use of Practices

In view of the diversity which obtains among these small colleges, it is inevitable that different colleges will have different problems of faculty recruitment, retention, and development. Because they differ in size, in strength of program, and in resources—both human and economic—it is to be expected that different institutions will have different approaches to the resolution of these problems as reflected in part by the practices which they employ. In the sections which follow, attention is given to three institutional variables which were found to affect the use of practices: emphasis on recruitment *versus* emphasis on orientation, size of faculty, and reputational strength.

Emphasis: Recruitment versus Orientation

Almost one-half of the respondents (45.4 per cent) reported that recruitment and orientation received about equal emphasis, somewhat more than one-third (38.8 per cent) reported greater emphasis on recruitment than on orientation, and less than one sixth (15.8 per cent) reported greater emphasis on orientation.

Institutions giving more emphasis to recruitment are on the average about the same size as those giving more emphasis to orientation (means of about 59 faculty members and 805 students as compared to means of about 58 and 792, respectively), with only slightly higher percentage of doctorates on the faculty (31.8 as compared to 29.0 per cent) and slightly higher average salary for full professors ($6,840 as compared to $6,460). While both groups on the average inducted about the same number of new faculty members for the academic year 1960-61 (mean of about sixteen), average percentage of faculty leaving the institution the previous year was slightly higher for the "recruitment" group—11.2 per cent as compared to 9.5 per cent.

Comparison of data on use of practices by extreme groups—great deal more emphasis on recruitment (19.2 per cent) *versus* great deal more emphasis on orientation (6.2 per cent) indicates, as expected, that "orientation emphasis" is primarily associated with considerably greater frequency of use of the practices included on the questionnaire. For the "orientation" group, median percentage of use for the 22 practices was 61.5 whereas for the "recruitment" group the comparable median was only 40.0—16 of the 22 practices are reported by a higher percentage of institutions with "orientation" emphasis.

---

[5] In his analysis of the career decisions of teachers Gustad found marked discrepancies between the rankings given by administrators and by faculty members to items pertaining to the "preferred way of spending time by faculty," "activities that ought to be rewarded" and other significant variables. The realistic administrator will not start with the premise that he *knows* what faculty members value. See John W. Gustad, *The Career Decisions of College Teachers* (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960) pp. 24ff.

Emphasis on "orientation" rather than on "recruitment" is also associated with some tendency toward greater "formality" in approaches to faculty development. More than one fourth (28.2 per cent) of respondents from institutions stressing "orientation" indicated, for example, that approaches to the induction of new faculty members were "mostly formal" as compared to only 7.2 per cent of those stressing "recruitment" and a similar pattern was found in responses related to the degree of formality in approaches to faculty development *after induction.*

Size of Faculty

As we have seen, the colleges included in the study differ markedly in size of faculty and student body. Some 9.1 per cent of the colleges reported less than 31 faculty members with the mean number for this group being roughly 26, while some 10.5 per cent reported more than 90 with a mean of approximately 123 faculty members. Trends in the data may be pointed up by reference to these extreme groups.

The problems facing these two groups of colleges are not similar. For example, the number of faculty members leaving for other positions during the year 1959-60 represented an average loss of some 22.9 per cent of the total faculty for the group lowest in faculty size, but the comparable figure was only 9.6 per cent for the group of larger colleges. Less favorable financial circumstances of the smaller institutions are evidenced in data on salaries paid full professors during the academic year 1960-61. Average salary increased regularly with faculty-size category, ranging from about $6,100 for the institutions with less than 31 faculty members to approximately $7,330 for those with more than 90.

In general, as size of faculty increases, the general frequency of use of practices increases. The median percentage of use for the 22 practices for the "smallest" institutions was roughly 37 per cent as compared to approximately 47 per cent for the "largest." Practices reported by a considerably greater proportion of the colleges with the largest faculties were as follows (percentages for the "largest" colleges given first):

Load adjustment for research and writing	**(72.7 vs. 26.3)**
Planned orientation for new faculty	**(77.3 vs. 36.8)**
Faculty committee on instruction	**(54.5 vs. 26.3)**
Sabbatical at half salary or more	**(40.9 vs. 21.2)**
Scheduled departmental conferences in some departments regarding teaching	**(77.3 vs. 52.6)**
Funds for attendance at professional meetings	**(81.8 vs. 63.2)**

The smallest institutions more frequently reported provisions of *funds for further graduate study of the faculty* (59.1 vs. 78.9).

Less frequent use of certain practices by the smaller institutions is not unexpected. For example, smaller institutions presumably have less need for formal orientation sessions and other *formalized* activities designed to bring faculty members into closer contact with each other and with general institutional concerns. In fact, about one-half of the institutions employing less than 31 faculty members as compared to less than one-sixth of the larger colleges indicated that approaches to the induction and further development of faculty members were "informal." And, because of the limited number of faculty members available for instructional assignments, limited financial resources, and perhaps low emphasis on the research function, such practices as load adjustments for research, sabbatical leaves, and funds for attendance at professional meetings may seem difficult to justify and/or sustain.

Reputational Strength

As noted earlier, based on data available for 149 of the 214 colleges, the colleges in this study may be differentiated with respect to the ratings of educators of their "strength and reputation for accomplishment of educational purpose" and these ratings are substantially related over institutions to average salary paid full professors and the proportion of faculty members holding a doctorate degree. As previously noted, these three variables were combined to form an Index of Reputational Strength (IRS). High-IRS institutions thus tend to be characterized by higher average salaries, a higher proportion of faculty members with doctorates and higher ratings for strength and accomplishment of purpose, than Low-IRS colleges.

When colleges were grouped according to position on the IRS—bottom fourth, middle half, and top fourth—and trends in the relative frequency with which practices were reported were examined for groups differing on the index, *use of several practices was found to increase regularly over IRS-categories,* as follows (percentage of use by highest fourth on the IRS followed by percentage of use in the lowest fourth):

Funds for publication of faculty writing	**(26.3 vs. 2.7)**
Less than normal load for first-year faculty	**(26.3 vs. 8.1)**
Sabbatical-year leaves at half salary	**(44.7 vs. 16.2)**
Load adjustment for research	**(55.3 vs. 21.6)**
Funds for further graduate study	**(65.8 vs. 54.1)**
Faculty committee on improving instruction	**(42.1 vs. 35.1)**
Planned orientation for new faculty	**(71.1 vs. 59.5)**
Funds for attending professional meetings	**(84.2 vs. 73.0)**

Only two practices were used substantially more frequently among Low-IRS than among High-IRS institutions, *viz., pre-college workshops for all faculty* (47.4 vs. 73.0) *and scheduled departmental conferences for discussion of improvement of teaching* (55.3 vs. 81.1). Most of the remaining practices were reported with about equal frequency by institutions in various IRS-categories, although some differences in utilization were evident.

Five of the eight practices which were definitely more characteristic of High- than of Low-IRS colleges are among the least frequently reported practices in the total sample. Judging from the nature of these practices, it may be inferred that as compared to Low-IRS colleges, the High-IRS group give more *attention to research and writing* and to *periodic refreshment and improvement of faculty members through sabbaticals and further graduate study*. Moreover, although relatively infrequently reported in any IRS group, provision of *funds for faculty publication* is made by more than nine times as many High- as Low-IRS institutions, and allowing *less than the normal load for first-year faculty members is* also a practice which sharply differentiates the two extreme IRS-groups.

These trends reflect relatively fundamental differences between the well established colleges with faculties having high levels of formal educational qualifications and relatively strong academic orientation (including some emphasis on research and publication) and those at the other extreme. The former group of institutions are able to attract better qualified faculty members and they are able to afford some of the more expensive faculty development practices.[6]

---

[6] In an analysis made by the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board of gifts received by 95 privately supported colleges included in this study, it was found that institutions in the top quarter on the IRS received gifts amounting to some $640 per student (all types of donors) while institutions in the lowest quarter received gifts amounting to only $351 per student. See, Southern Regional Education Board, "Trends in Voluntary Support," *Financing Higher Education, No. 9.* (Atlanta, Georgia: The Author, Undated).

Faculty Development Procedures or Faculty Development Programs?

It is evident that some of the practices and provisions under consideration in this study may be found in *every* college. However, a very meaningful distinction may be made between the use of certain procedures for faculty improvement and the existence of a clearly articulated *program* for faculty development at a college. The use of a given practice, of course, does not require justification in terms of its relevance to an overall plan or program, or to other practices—perhaps each of the practices designated earlier in this chapter may be thought of as having independent utility and value. However, it is a basic assumption of this study that the most effective efforts at faculty development will prove to be those which reflect careful planning and coordination of a variety of relevant procedures. It is further assumed that an institution's responsibility and concern for faculty improvement might quite reasonably be projected over a time span from "recruitment to retirement," or from "selection to separation."

There is little reason to conclude after interviews on 20 campuses and examination of responses to the basic questionnaire that procedures employed by the small colleges of the region represent approaches to the implementation of *planned programs* for faculty development projected to encompass a broad range of developmental problems, although it can be said that there is considerable variation among institutions in the extent to which their efforts are characterized by "structure" as evidenced by the following criteria:

1. Administrators express a clear concept of the process of faculty development, including attention to its major aspects, elements, or dimensions,
2. Major problems in respect to faculty development are reasonably clearly defined,
3. Major goals and objectives are clearly formulated,
4. Procedures are consciously designed in terms of the goals and objectives expressed,
5. Faculty members are aware of the existence of a "program" for development.

Interviews with administrators and faculty members were designed, in part, to provide a basis for judgment regarding the extent to which these criteria were met on the various campuses involved. It was evident that there *were* differences among the colleges in respect to the extent to which the several criteria for "structure" were met and six of the 20 colleges, in the judgment of the interviewer, had reasonably clearly "structured" programs for development. However, because of the relatively subjective nature of the procedure employed in identifying the six institutions and factors related to method of selecting the sample, detailed comparisons of the six institutions having "more structured" programs with the remaining fourteen were not considered appropriate.[7]

An effort was made to elicit from faculty members interviewed reasons for coming to their respective institutions, degree of satisfaction with their current employment, and related questions in order to examine the possibility of a relationship between presence in a college of a more clearly defined *program* for development—a "structured" program—and institutional appeal in the recruitment and/or retention of faculty, faculty attitudes, etc.

Slight but not statistically significant differences favoring the six institutions with more clearly structured approaches were found in respect to expressions of faculty satisfaction in one comparison—of interviewed faculty members in the six colleges approximately 78 per cent indicated that they planned to remain for the foreseeable future at their current institutions whereas only 71 per cent of those at the remaining 14 institutions did so. In addition, certain *sources of satisfaction* with the present context of employment were more frequently cited by faculty at the six colleges judged to have more definitely structured programs, namely, *quality of colleagues, a general atmosphere of freedom, voice and involvement in the total program of the college, and a teaching emphasis—but with some related research opportunities.*

For reasons which have already been noted, analysis of the concomitants of "degree of structure" was limited, and it cannot be concluded that any substantive evidence has been adduced to support the assumption that "structure" and "effectiveness of faculty development" are associated. This, of course, was not a major purpose of the study. The important conclusion is that there is a dearth of well articulated, comprehensively designed *programs* for development characterized by a distinctive philosophy and projection of institutional concern for a process of faculty orientation and development from "selection" to "separation."

---

[7] It will be recalled that in the selection of the 20 colleges, those *low in percentage of faculty with the doctorate,* in terms of *salary paid full professors,* and *number of practices reported* were deliberately *eliminated from consideration.* Fifteen of the 20 colleges were, in consequence, above average on the Index of Reputational Strength, which indicates that they have attained a reasonable degree of success in *institutional development* which implies general faculty improvement. This factor complicates efforts to compare degrees of structure within the sample visited or to reach conclusions regarding the relationship between "structure" and evidence of "success" in development

Summary and Discussion

While this study was being planned, some educators expressed the belief that few faculty development procedures would be found to be in extensive use in small colleges. The findings which have been reviewed appear to confirm this belief in that only four of the 22 specific practices selected for study are reported by as many as two thirds of the 214 colleges participating in the general inquiry, while 12 of the 22 practices are reported by less than one half of the colleges. It remains, however, that ten of the practices are in use by more than one half of the colleges.

Administrators reporting the use of particular practices tend to rate those practices as of more than limited value although certain practices received considerably higher ratings than others. The more frequently reported practices tend to receive higher value ratings by "users" than less frequently reported practices but there are notable exceptions to this trend. For example, the highest value rating was given the practice of providing *sabbatical leaves at half salary or more* but less than one third of the colleges reported this practice.

It can be stated that a majority of administrators responding to the basic questionnaire and a majority of faculty members interviewed thought the practices under consideration had some degree of utility and value. However, faculty members tended to attach greater importance to some practices than did administrators, reflecting differences in point of view which have considerable significance. For example, *less than normal load for first-year faculty members* and *adjustment in load for research and writing* were among the six most valuable practices *from the faculty point of view* but these practices were lower-ranked by administrators. "Faculty handbooks" and "pre-college workshops" on the other hand, low-ranked by faculty, were given high rank by deans.

The great majority of institutions report (a) predominantly informal approaches to the induction, orientation, and in-service development of the faculty, and (b) at least as much emphasis on the identification and recruitment of new faculty members as on orienting faculty members to their jobs and the institution after they are hired. However, approaches to development as reflected in the use of certain practices vary with institutional size, emphasis on recruitment or orientation, and reputational strength. We have seen, as expected, that institutions with larger faculties somewhat more frequently report formal approaches than do those with smaller faculties; that colleges reporting more emphasis on orientation than on recruitment and those with larger faculties use more of the practices surveyed.

Institutions high on the Index of Reputational Strength—with greater resources—as compared to Low-IRS colleges more frequently report some of the more expensive practices (e.g., sabbaticals) and some that reflect greater emphasis on research and scholarship. Thus, it is worth noting that small colleges high on the IRS—with better qualified faculties, better general reputation for strength, paying better salaries, and attracting more in gifts from foundations—are characterized by greater frequency of use of the procedures *that are valued by the faculty and that require distinctive administrative effort and allocation of resources.*

Responsibility for "faculty development" typically lies with the dean of the college but it is clear that responsibility is shared with other individuals, most frequently either the president or one or more departmental chairmen.

The absence, generally speaking, of clearly conceptualized and carefully coordinated *programmatic* approaches to development has been noted. Despite the relatively unsystematic character of current efforts at development, however, it is quite clear that considerable attention is being given by the small colleges of the region to practices designed to (a) help orient new faculty members to the institution and encourage the identification of faculty members, new and old, with institutional purposes and problems, (b) provide incentive and opportunity for improvement of faculty members in teaching effectiveness, and (c) contribute to faculty morale. In the following three chapters these interrelated aspects of faculty orientation and in-service development, and related problems, practices and provisions will be considered in some detail.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

CHAPTER IV

Helping Faculty Members Fit In and Advance the Purposes of the Institution

AMONG the desired goals of faculty development, few are more important than those of increased faculty awareness of and identification with the aims and purposes of the college and increased understanding on the part of faculty members of their roles in advancing the purposes of the college. College administrators need not be reminded that attainment of these goals is not a straightforward matter! Some faculty members are only nominally "identified" with the college—their primary identification is with their discipline or their professional colleagues. Other faculty members are unconcerned or even naive about institutional "goals and objectives," and still others have well developed ideas regarding the "purposes of the college" which conflict sharply with those of the college at which they are currently employed. And many faculty members do not support unreservedly attempts by the administration to encourage faculty participation in activities perceived to be outside the scope of the "teaching role."

On the other side of the coin, it must be noted candidly that many college administrators have not recognized that there may be lack of identity in what a college professes to be, what it actually is, and what students, faculty members, and supporters, both present and prospective, think it is. If the typically professed, catalog-oriented objectives are thought of as representing "reality" by administrators it cannot be expected that faculty members will be enthusiastic about efforts to encourage identification therewith! In many instances, sound is confused with substance—"provision of a strong liberal arts education" has an impressive ring but even cursory examination of "liberal arts colleges" will indicate that all kinds of curricula, attitudes, and concepts obtain among institutions which espouse this objective. If those at the highest administrative level, who are responsible for enunciating the objectives of the institution as a whole, are not fully conscious of the need for closing the gap between profession of purpose, actual accomplishment, and perception of purpose it cannot be expected that much will be done to develop within a faculty a general sense of commitment to institutional goals as well as personal, professional, or disciplinary goals which are very important but highly individualistic.

To emphasize further the complexities and complications which confront those who strive for increased faculty awareness of institutional aims and of their roles in advancing these aims, one need only note that colleges exist in a social context which is dynamic. Today's needs are not necessarily those of tomorrow, the constituency of a college may change, and aims cannot be fixed and inflexible if a college is committed to meeting the changing needs of citizens in a complex, industrial society. Institutional objectives which are clearly stated, generally understood, and relevant at one stage in an institution's development may become obscure and even inappropriate at a later stage. Thus, attention to the problem of assessing aims and purposes must be continuous.

Basic to the attainment of the goals of increasing faculty awareness of and identification with institutional aims, and understanding of their roles in advancing these aims, is continuous, perceptive, and imaginative administrative leadership concerned with (a) facilitating the flow, internally and externally, of accurate information about the college, (b) maximizing opportunities for all faculty members to learn more about and to exert an influence on the context in which they are working—from the time of their induction into the faculty to the time of their termination of employment with the institution, and (c) developing a genuine community of interest and concern regarding institutional objectives and institutional problems.[1]

---

[1] The importance of clarifying and communicating institutional expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities from the time of recruitment onward cannot be overemphasized. For example, in her study of faculty role perceptions in a group of Texas institutions Allen found that the degree to which impressions formed *during the employ-*

When translated into the "faculty development" frame of reference, these concerns may be thought of as being of two major types: concern with informing faculty members and concern with involving faculty members. It should not be assumed that these two aspects are mutually exclusive. Faculty members can best be "informed" about institutional purposes, policies and procedures through involvement with other faculty members in a process of critical examination and analysis designed not only to permit them to learn more about significant aspects of the institution but also to provide a basis for constructive change based on cooperative effort. It can be assumed that for faculty members who are "informed" and "involved" *from the time of their induction,* the process of assimilation into the life of the college—with the implied concomitants of adjustment, understanding of individual role and institutional expectations, and increased awareness of and identification with institutional purposes and objectives—will be facilitated. This is a critical area for faculty development for, as Tyler[2] has suggested,

> when [a complex institution such as a college] is composed of individuals with different abilities and functions and when their effectiveness depends largely on their own exercise of initiative, originality, and judgment, the leadership of the institution depends less on rules and directives for achieving some unity and much more on the *development among the members of shared values* [emphasis added].

Of the 33 provisions and practices treated in the basic questionnaire the ten discussed in this chapter may be thought of as potentially useful for increasing faculty awareness of and identification with institutional aims, for informing faculty members of institutional characteristics, and for involving faculty members in institution-wide activities.[3]

---

ment interview were consistent wth reality as experienced on the job was one of the factors determining the adjustment of the new faculty member to the employing institution. [See Lucile Allen, "Faculty Expectations, Satisfactions, and Morale," in *Studies of College Faculty* (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1961) and the final report on this important study currently in preparation by Lucile Allen and Robert L. Sutherland, to be published by the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Austin, Texas.]

[2] Ralph W. Tyler, "Insights from the Behavioral Sciences," in Frank C. Abbott, Editor, *Faculty-Administration Relationships* (Washington, D.C.; The American Council on Education, 1958) p. 36.

[3] Classification of provisions and practices generally was based on a judgmental evaluation of the relevance of a particular practice to one of the three major areas of faculty-development concern outlined earlier. It is, of course, obvious that all areas are interrelated and that a substantive improvement in one area of development, e.g. increased faculty understanding of institutional objectives, may well have carry-over into other

Examined in this chapter are provisions for giving the new faculty member information about (a) the total institution, its aims, policies, and regulations, (b) the characteristics of fellow faculty members and the student body, and (c) the community, as well as provisions for (d) helping new faculty members to become sympathetic with and concerned about the aims and purposes of the college, and (e) giving orientation to the wives of new faculty members. Also considered are five specific practices, namely, (a) planned orientation sessions for all new faculty members, (b) pre-college workshop for all faculty, (c) a faculty handbook, (d) organized, systematic, and periodic faculty self-study of the college, and (e) adjustment in teaching load of individuals to allow time for faculty committee work.

Informing, Involving and Orienting New Faculty Members

Most of the colleges (89.5 per cent) report that they attempt to *inform new faculty about the college as a whole (aims, policies, etc.)*, and almost three-fourths (74.2 per cent) of the colleges report provisions for *helping new faculty to become sympathetic with and concerned about the aims of the college*. Considerably fewer of these colleges appear to be concerned with *giving the new faculty member information about the community* (44.0 per cent); even fewer (36.8 per cent) have provisions for *giving the new faculty member information about the characteristics of his colleagues and the student body. Orientation of faculty wives*—whose ability to adjust to the college environment may be more than tangentially related to the adjustment of their respective husbands—is provided for by only 26.8 per cent of the colleges.

Provisions for informing new faculty about the college as a whole and for encouraging identification with institutional aims are considered to be "among the most important" which an institution could provide by the majority of respondents reporting such provisions; substantially fewer rate the other provisions mentioned above as "among the most important."

The prospective faculty member is, in some colleges, provided with reprints of faculty articles from professional journals and feature articles about the instructional program. Some colleges capitalize on the opportunity to provide orientation and give a variety of relevant types of information during the employment process. They arrange for the prospective faculty member to see the total picture rather

---

areas, e.g., improvement of teaching effectiveness. It is, however, useful and convenient to consider certain practices as having particular relevance for particular objectives of development.

than just to be "looked over." It is the intent of such colleges to be certain, from the beginning, that they are selecting persons whose philosophies are in harmony with the purposes of the college. It is also their intent to make certain that prospective faculty members are fully and accurately informed about the college.

Other colleges are not content to limit the "informing process" to the employment and orientation stage. They provide new faculty with a type of on-campus involvement that by its nature focuses attention on policies, so that all faculty members come to know the reasons for existing policy and can examine critically the stated purposes of the college. Some deans state that faculty can best see the purposes of the college through routine and normally close contacts with a student group in which an *esprit de corps* has been established. These deans believe that students in such colleges can do more to give new faculty the proper understanding of college purposes than can be provided through any administration-directed activities.

Continued interpretation and discussion of aims by the college leadership is important. In a few places the deans indicated that they schedule at least one conference with each new faculty member about mid-way of the first semester to give information that may be needed at that time.

Despite the low incidence of provisions for *orienting faculty wives* and for *informing faculty members about the community,* the importance of these aspects of orientation should not be underestimated. The administrators interviewed tended to stress the fact that a small college must be a "good citizen of the local community" and that efforts must be made to develop such an image. Few institutions, however, have formal procedures for orienting faculty members to the community. They do attempt to help faculty members make appropriate contacts and encourage them to contribute their talents in community affairs. Some colleges publicize talents of faculty through brochures, or through a speaker's bureau. As for the orientation of faculty wives, while this may not be considered crucial for faculty development it is of interest to recall from Table 1 that less than 10 per cent of the respondents rated such provisions as "not very important"! A few institutions indicate that they ask wives to be present at the initial employment interview.

Another type of provision, although more directly relevant than those just discussed, seems to have a somewhat similar status in terms of use. Only slightly more than one-third of the respondents report provisions for *informing new faculty members of the characteristics of the student body and of their colleagues.* It is understood, of course, that a prospective faculty member typically has some impressions regarding the quality of students, their academic aptitude level or their geographic origins, as well as of the general characteristics of faculty members at the institution with which he is seeking employment. These impressions, however, may or may not be valid or realistic. *To minimize misconceptions* both prospective and newly hired faculty members need to be given relevant information.

A few colleges prepare "class profiles" showing the standing of entering freshmen on scholastic aptitude tests, the general background of entering students and other data designed to be of interest to both prospective students and prospective faculty members. Interviews with students and with college personnel who are most knowledgeable about students are arranged for by some institutions. Very little is done, however, with regard to describing the characteristics of the faculty. Some faculty members interviewed indicated a keen interest in knowing more about the backgrounds of colleagues. One device reported consisted of a collection of brief biographical sketches on all faculty members.

It is evident from interviews and intensive questionnaires that those colleges which make an effort to provide information about student and faculty characteristics do this *before* the faculty member takes the job. However, *one can hardly avoid the impression that relatively few institutions have dealt systematically with the problem of developing meaningful descriptions of their student bodies, and very few indeed have considered the problem of describing the faculty in terms other than "degrees earned" and "publications."*

Orientation Programs, Workshops and Faculty Handbooks

Orientation sessions for new faculty members, pre-college workshops, and faculty handbooks represent relatively specific and somewhat formalized methods of providing information about the college —information designed to facilitate the adjustment of new faculty members and to involve all faculty members in matters of general concern to the institution.

At about two thirds of the colleges deans reported use of (a) *a faculty handbook* (65.6 per cent), (b) *planned orientation sessions for all new faculty members* (67.0 per cent), and (c) a *pre-college workshop for all faculty members* (63.2 per cent). Each of these practices was rated as of more than limited value by over 90 per cent of respondents reporting them. High-IRS (top fourth) institutions as compared to Low-IRS institutions somewhat more frequently employ planned orientation sessions for new faculty members (71 per cent as compared to 60 per cent) and less frequently use the pre-college workshop (47 per cent as compared to 73 per cent).

Typically, orientation sessions are devoted to discussion of such matters as the objectives of the college, general policies, current problems of concern to the institution and other matters of particular interest to new members. The formal orientation session, of course, is only one device through which institutions attempt to help new faculty members learn more about the college.

The pre-college workshops reported by respondents usually last for about one and one-half days. They typically have a central theme selected from current issues in higher education or arising from some special interest or concern of the college. Panel discussions, small group discussions, papers, and other procedures may be involved. In one college, the theme of a recent workshop was "the pursuit of excellence" with such topics as "challenging the superior student," "student motivation and student learning," and "new techniques in teaching," being considered by discussion groups. General workshop sessions are frequently followed by departmental meetings so that each department might have an opportunity to consider the implications of points made in the general sessions for departmental activity during the year.

Faculty handbooks contain a variety of information about the institution, personnel policies, committees, statements on academic freedom, and the like. *Faculty members interviewed considered the handbook to be useful, but they gave it a more limited endorsement than did deans.* Clearly, the handbook represents only one method of disseminating information and it should be remembered that the embodiment in print of institutional policies, procedures, and pronouncements does not insure action in accordance with the implied aspirations.

Involvement Through Self-Study and Committee Assignments

While much can be accomplished through practices of the kind just considered, more extensive involvement of faculty members in the active consideration of institutional concerns is gained through the institutional self-study and through work on various committees. About two thirds (67.9 per cent) of the institutions report *organized, systematic, and periodic faculty self-study of the college,* and over 90 per cent of deans reporting such a practice consider it to be "among the most valuable" practices for faculty development. The relatively extensive use of this device is due both to the "encouragement" of accrediting associations and to recognition of its utility by institutions.

Deans interviewed felt strongly that involvement of the faculty in a self-study of the institution enabled them to develop a clearer understanding of the problems and purposes of the college. It was also thought of as a means for giving faculty members a greater voice in determining the direction of the college. Faculty members, while acknowledging the general worth of self-study, expressed certain complaints: that it is time-consuming and hard work; that they are assigned to areas not related to their interests or their fields: that the self-study is sometimes quite perfunctory.

It goes without saying that when a self-study is undertaken simply to meet accreditation requirements neither the administration nor the faculty realize much from it. The meaningfulness of the self-study is in proportion to the desire of all concerned to come to grips with recognized problems and issues. Much of the difficulty lies in the fact that critical examination of institutional problems is not a well-established habit![4]

As indicated at the outset, the specialized interests of many faculty members, their frequently narrow conceptualization of their roles within the institution, and the desire to avoid involvement outside these "roles" constitute barriers to the development of an institutional point of view. However, the self-study provides a frame of reference for securing faculty involvement which, if properly handled, can serve as a spring-board to the enlargement of faculty interest in shaping institutional aims and objectives while, at the same time, forwarding their own aims and aspirations.

Relatively few respondents (30.6 per cent) reported *adjustments in teaching loads of individuals to allow time for faculty committee work,* although the vast majority of those reporting this practice felt it to be valuable (79.6 per cent). A faculty member's desire "to be involved" may conflict with his desire to avoid what may be perceived as unnecessary and excessive committee work. Many faculty members see committee work (in connection either with a self-study or normal college work) as necessary when related to the academic program and its reputation, or to matters of faculty welfare, and they view work on such committees with favor. However, service on other types of committees may be undertaken with less enthusiasm.

---

[4] An excellent rationale for *continuing* institutional self-study, or *institutional research,* has been suggested by Miller:

> Institutional research is still a new undertaking in most institutions. This is particularly true in small colleges. Its function is in some respects analogous to the function in society of the college itself. The college provides to young men and women knowledge about themselves and the world around them and if they are wise, these young people use this knowledge to improve and enrich their lives. Similarly, institutional research provides to faculty and administration a detailed knowledge about their own collegiate institution and the setting within which it must work—knowledge which can be used to improve and enrich the college experience.

See, James L. Miller, Jr., "Institutional Research in Small Colleges," in *Research for Small Colleges* (Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, School of Education, 1962) pp. 1-15.

The value of committee work is not limited to the service rendered to the college and the element of control provided to the faculty. As a device for faculty development, it is viewed by deans as a valuable method for assimilating faculty into the life of the college. In the case of new faculty members, service on or "auditing" of the sessions of an appropriate committee can serve as a useful learning experience. At one college, for example, new faculty members meet with two or three of the more important committees at times when they are considering matters affecting the total college program (see description of Goucher College program, Appendix A).

In efforts to "help faculty members fit in," attention to mechanics will not suffice. Committees, self-studies, orientation sessions, and the like will be useful only in proportion to the extent that they are perceived as meaningful by both faculty and administration and the extent to which they are "directed" by those with the art of allowing breathing room for the non-conformist.

Summary and Discussion

Administrators of small colleges in the region express a very realistic concern for informing faculty members about the college, for orienting them to institutional purposes and problems, and for giving them opportunities to study and shape institutional policies and objectives. In fact, "giving new faculty members information about the total institution, its aims, policies, and regulations," was the most frequently reported and endorsed of the practices or provisions under consideration. Formal practices—e.g., orientation sessions, pre-college workshops, faculty handbooks, institutional self-study—are among the most frequently employed, and all are considered to be valuable by administrators. It will be recalled, however, that these practices are not ranked as high in value by faculty members as they are by deans. And, it is obvious that they can be successful *only* to the extent that they have meaning for faculty members.

While the institutional self-study was endorsed by administrators the fact that typically the self-study is *ad hoc* rather than part of a continuous effort at institutional self-evaluation (reflecting a more or less continuous degree of faculty and administrative concern for critical analysis of institutional problems) leads to some complications and to attenuation of its usefulness. The question of the extent to which a faculty member *should* be concerned with institutional problems, and involved in activities not directly related to *instruction,* is, of course, always at issue. However, it seems probable that *sustained* efforts to involve faculty members would lead to a better solution to this question than that resulting from the relatively infrequent, large-scale involvement now characteristic of the self-study program.

Relatively few institutions (about 37 per cent) report that they give new faculty members information about the characteristics of fellow faculty members and the student body. It is likely that a majority of the colleges do not give such information because *it is not available* in meaningful form. Useful information about the characteristics of the student body and of the faculty *can* be obtained with relatively modest expenditure of time and effort. Knowledge of faculty attributes—interests, special research skills, undergraduate origins, professional affiliations, publications—can serve both as a partial assessment of an important institutional "resource" and as a basis for attracting and informing prospective members of the faculty.

CHAPTER V

Stimulating Professional Growth and the Development of Teaching Effectiveness

According to the expressions of deans interviewed, improvement of teaching effectiveness and professional growth generally are perhaps the most important goals of faculty development. Yet *only five of 15 specific practices or types of provisions classified as most relevant to this area of faculty development were reported by as many as 50 per cent of the small colleges in the region.* At the same time, high percentages of the administrators reporting use of these procedures assigned relatively high value to them.

The relatively low frequency of use of procedures for the "improvement of teaching effectiveness" is probably not unique to small colleges. Like larger institutions, small colleges are handicapped in their efforts to institute procedures for the development of "teaching effectiveness" because they have something less than complete understanding of what it is they desire to develop and somewhat less than adequate techniques for the evaluation of what has been developed.[1]

---

[1] For a summary of factors considered in evaluating faculty members in different types of institutions see John W. Gustad, "Policies and Practices in Faculty Evaluation," *The Educational Record,* Vol. 42, July 1961. This report of a recent questionnaire survey conducted by the Committee on College Teaching of the American Council on Education, based on replies from 584 institutions of which 272 were liberal arts colleges, indicated

Much current effort at evaluation of teaching effectiveness, for example, involves little more than the unsystematic combination of opinions—of students, department heads, administrators, or colleagues. Although deans report that such opinions show considerable consistency when collected systematically and purposefully, they are nevertheless still "opinions"—possibly more nearly reflecting impressions of the kind of person a faculty member is than the quality of job he is doing.

Scholarship, professional growth, and service to the institution often can be rated in terms of some agreed upon and more visible activities—publications, talks to professional groups, participation in working committees of the college, etc.—but the individual faculty member's teaching effectiveness, per se, is difficult to isolate and to evaluate.

Because of the complexity of this problem, the high value assigned to procedures designed to improve teaching effectiveness, and the relatively low use of many of these procedures, it is particularly worthwhile to examine the nature of problems and procedures reported in this area. Fifteen practices and provisions are considered in this chapter in the following classifications: practices or provisions designed for the general improvement of instruction, those designed to assist the beginning teacher, and those designed to facilitate and encourage professional growth and development.

Improvement of Instruction

Certain of the 15 procedures seem logically to be most relevant for the purpose of development of the faculty in their understanding of the nature of college teaching and in their general proficiency as teachers. These are (a) *systematic visitation of classes by administrative officers or other faculty members,* (b) *presence of an active committee charged with the improvement of instruction,* (c) *scheduled conferences in some departments to deal specifically with the improvement of teaching,* (d) *organized series of faculty discussions of college teaching,* (e) *series of visiting lecturers to discuss problems of higher education, and* (f) *collection of library materials on higher education for faculty use.*

Only two of these procedures—departmental conferences and collection of library materials—*are reported to be in use by as many as 50 per cent of the colleges.*

---

that "classroom teaching" was universally cited as the most important single factor in evaluating faculty members; of 14 factors cited, classroom teaching was first-ranked in all institutional categories except one.

Classroom Visitation

Classroom visitation is a procedure often suggested but infrequently used! Although deans may form judgments (and do form them) regarding the "teaching effectiveness" of faculty members they seldom express a willingness to go into classrooms for direct observation. In the colleges visited, the deans typically expressed the feeling that faculty members would resent visitors; but if faculty expressions are considered, most of them would welcome a visitor, given knowledge as to why he was there and the assurance of his interest in what is happening in the class. *They do not welcome "observation" purely for administrative rating,* and it is obviously somewhat difficult to be completely certain of the motivation of an "observer." Perhaps lack of clarity regarding the purpose of classroom visitation is one relevant factor in the interpretation of the finding that *only two of the 20 deans interviewed indicated that the administration feels free to visit classes and that they do so with any degree of regularity*. In four or five of these institutions, some department heads were involved in a program of visitation.

It is entirely likely that the faculty of small colleges are not nearly as inclined as the deans may think to say that "my classroom is my castle." Classroom observation might make a much more significant contribution—not to mention a more widespread one—to the process of improving instruction if deans and department heads worked to establish more clearly the purposes of such a program, learn more about how to visit classes as participants and learners rather than as evaluators, and establish the proper atmosphere for communicating their impressions to faculty members.

Only about 15 per cent of all colleges report systematic visitation programs, but almost three fourths of this relatively small group rate the procedure as valuable.[2] Incidence of use of this procedure is about the same for High- and Low-IRS colleges.

Faculty Committee

Faculty committees charged with improving instruction—typically called committees on instruction or committees on curriculum—were reported by about 40 per cent of all colleges; more frequently by the high strength group than by the low strength group.

---

[2] Classroom visitation was reported as one means of gathering data for evaluating classroom teaching by fully one third of the group of 272 liberal arts colleges and by about one half of the public and private universities, respectively, involved in the recent American Council on Education survey (see Gustad, *ibid.*) The figure of 15 per cent of the small colleges reporting systematic classroom visitation in this study thus becomes even smaller by comparison. In evaluating these figures, however, it is important to recognize that an institution which could not report a program of *systematic* classroom visits by administrators for purpose of evaluating teaching might well be able to report that classroom visits were *one* of the sources of data for evaluation.

The responsibilities of such a committee vary greatly among colleges. At Louisiana College, for example, the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Excellence lies primarily in the area of honors programs and the promotion of new development. At Birmingham-Southern College, where the Committee on Instruction has quite successfully given its major attention to sponsoring a visiting professors program, faculty members have had an opportunity for associations that they otherwise would not have had. In this college, the committee is being reorganized to form two committees—one of which will be a Faculty Development Committee for the purpose of making recommendations for positions, orienting new faculty members, and suggesting promotions, tenure, and salary increases.

Among faculty members interviewed at institutions where such committees were present, those not on the committee tended to assign it less value than did the dean. Possibly this indicates that the committee is perceived as largely administrative in its orientation.

Scheduled Departmental Conferences

The scheduled departmental conference (in some departments) to deal specifically with the improvement of teaching, reported by about three fourths of all small colleges, is the most frequently used procedure of the six treated in this section. Although rated as valuable when used in both the High- and Low-IRS groups, it is more frequently reported by Low-IRS institutions than by the High-IRS group.

Information obtained during interviews and through more detailed questionnaires indicates that inclusion of the word "scheduled," in the item led to the reporting of some departmental activities that were "on the calendar" and the omission of some activities that were related to the "improvement of teaching." Impressions gained through interviews lead to the conclusion that *lack of full communication between department heads and deans limited the information deans had to report on departmental conferences.*

Generally speaking, conferences are scheduled either as a result of initiative by a department head or at the request of the administration. These conferences are considered by deans to deal with rather general but important aspects of instruction—relating college and departmental aims, testing and grading practices, curriculum revision, and the like.

One interesting departmental program—at Southeastern Louisiana College—involves the Department of Mathematics which conducts seminars dealing with recent developments in certain areas of mathematics. The topic for a seminar is determined by the entire department in departmental meetings and the person in the department who is most acquainted with the subject is asked to serve as the leader for the seminar. Approximately six hours are given to each seminar. Subjects for recent seminars have been modern mathematics, topology, and statistics. These seminars provide an impetus to the improvement of instruction through keeping members of the department alert to current and significant developments in the general field of mathematics.

Organized Faculty Discussion of College Teaching

Some 43 per cent of the colleges report provisions for faculty discussion of various matters relating to college teaching, with little variation in use or value assigned between Low- and High-IRS groups. Colleges which schedule such discussions usually do so about six times each year, and about 40 per cent of these do it so systematically as to permit announcement of the series at the beginning of the school year.

Selection of topics for discussion typically is made by a committee in which there is heavy representation of faculty, and the topics usually stem from the expressed interests of the faculty. Such subjects as "qualitative and quantitative aspects of the grading system," "a program for encouraging the excellent student," and "panel discussion of the art of teaching," are illustrative of topics reported for scheduled discussions.

In some instances, discussions are implemented in the context of a faculty club. For example, faculty members at Queens College prepare and hear reports on readings from professional journals on the subject of higher education at dinner meetings scheduled once each month. This procedure originated, in part, out of a desire to conserve faculty reading time.

Efforts have been made in some colleges to capitalize on existing programs in the community for the purpose of developing faculty members. An example here is provided by the Committee on Instruction at Birmingham-Southern College which sponsored attendance of a group of faculty members at the training sessions for Great Books discussion leaders. Following this experience, those who participated established a program for the faculty with books of their own selection.

In other situations, the faculty meeting is used for discussion of relevant aspects of college teaching. At Southeastern Louisiana College, some "professional faculty meetings" are scheduled each year in addition to regular meetings. The "professional" meetings are devoted to consideration of subjects relevant to the improvement of teaching. At Delta State College, discussions of college teaching at the regular faculty meeting each month were planned over a two year period. Guided by a faculty planning committee, the topics considered were in such areas as teaching with audio-visual aids, teaching science to the general student, and teaching the academically talented. After the second year of this type of activity, the committee suggested that books on higher education be provided in a special section of the library and that future discussions in faculty meetings be based on these books.

Still another variation is represented by a less formally scheduled program for the presentation of faculty papers at Jacksonville University. No definite dates are set for sessions, but usually there is one each month. For interested faculty members, and open to students by invitation, sessions are devoted to subjects suggested by various faculty members.

Visiting Lecturers on Higher Education

Slightly more than one third of all institutions report lecture series. Closer examination indicates that in some instances, lectures were on topics rather tenuously connected with "higher education" but in most instances it appears that institutions reporting such a series of lectures restricted their reports to series concerned with higher education and involving speakers who were "specialists" in this area. Such series were held in slightly higher esteem by institutions in the High-IRS category than by those in the Low-IRS group, but there were no significant differences in frequency of use among various IRS-groups.

Information from detailed questionnaires and from interviews suggests that such series are considered to be helpful in several ways: (a) the lecturer is available as a consultant on specific problems, (b) faculty members are able to hear more about what other colleges are doing, and (c) exposure to new points of view on teaching and to different philosophies of education often results in increased faculty interest.

Special Collection of Library Materials

Provision of a special collection of materials on higher education is reported by about 64 per cent of all the institutions. In general, provision of library materials rests on the assumption that their availability will encourage faculty members to become better informed on current trends and issues in higher education. Attempts to motivate faculty to use the material generally take the form of announcements of availability.

Where an effort had been made to stimulate faculty use of available material, and where committee or self-study activity encouraged use, collections of relevant literature were rated as valuable by faculty members interviewed.

Assisting the Beginning Teacher

The foregoing procedures are designed to contribute to the general improvement of instruction. While new faculty members who have not had previous teaching experience may benefit from all these procedures, their problems are somewhat unique and they often may need personal assistance.

Assistance to the beginning college teacher may be provided through close contact with a department head or senior colleague who makes little effort to provide directive advice or instruction but who may, by force of example, inspire and motivate the beginning teacher. One department head, drawing from his own experience, suggested the importance of motivating the beginning teacher to develop his own methods: "I developed my own methods," he said, "by listing what I considered to be the best techniques of some of my teachers. I believe that what little success I have had in the classroom is due to two things: (1) I feel the methods are mine; and (2) I have confidence in the methods because I worked them out for myself." This department head stressed development, in the new teacher, of a sense of pride in college teaching and a sense of concern about what is taught and how it is taught—a process which requires patience but which yields lasting results.

Another type of personal assistance is represented by consultation of the dean or department head with the new teacher. Such consultation, however, requires great tact and understanding. Deans and department heads tend to believe that this procedure is most successful *when it is a regular and expected practice,* obviating the suspicion that "suggestions are being made only in particularly 'needy' cases."

Making available to the new faculty member a course syllabus or outline is a practice which is valued more highly by beginning teachers than often is realized. Moreover, involvement of the new person in the revision of syllabi is often a means of providing him with an opportunity for developing ideas regarding the organization of course material.

New faculty members may profit from the use of self-evaluation procedures employed by other faculty members at the institution. Forms of various types for faculty self-rating and comparable forms for student ratings of faculty can be made available to new faculty members, as is done at Austin College, along with orientation in the interpretation of both student ratings and faculty self-ratings.

The approaches considered above are illustrative of ways in which provision is being made for personalized assistance to the beginning teacher. About 58 per cent of the 214 colleges report that some provisions are made *for giving first-year faculty members continuing personal assistance with teaching problems.* Many small colleges of the region are clearly attempting to deal with development of the beginning college teacher in the "art of teaching" in a variety of ways, but none seems to be doing so in a very systematic way.

In addition to the approaches already considered, two specific practices included on the general questionnaire having relevance for this area are as follows: (a) *assignment of an experienced teacher to work with a first year teacher in developing instructional techniques,* and (b) *less than a normal teaching load for first-year faculty.* Less than one third of all colleges follow the first practice and only about one fifth allow reduced loads for first year teachers (a practice which is much more characteristic of High- than of Low-IRS colleges).

Analysis of detailed information provided by colleges which report that they assign an experienced teacher to work with new faculty suggests that, *in practice, the type of assistance rendered does little more than extend the process of "orientation."* From this process, however, it does appear that new faculty members are made more aware of the persons and places where they may receive additional assistance. Relatively few deans report that the relationship between the "master teacher" and his "apprentice" is a formal one—rather, the senior faculty man typically is charged with "being available" at the right time and with providing assistance in an informal and unobtrusive manner. Only a very adept, capable, and tactful senior colleague can maintain this type of relationship effectively and one suspects that this kind of person is often not available! In both the Low- and High-IRS groups, this practice is thought of as valuable by deans who reported its use.

More than one fourth of the High-IRS institutions but only about 8 per cent of the Low-IRS institutions report reduction in teaching load for new teachers, though "users" in both groups rate the procedure as valuable. Interviewed faculty members were inclined to view this practice as very good in principle but it was recognized as being difficult to arrange because of enrollment pressures. About 40 per cent of the small number of colleges reporting this procedure indicate that it is used with all new faculty and that the typical reduction in load is about three credit hours. Deans favoring this practice argue that a reduced load gives the faculty member time needed to organize courses, become oriented to a new situation, and make necessary adjustments.

It is evident that procedures designed to provide direct assistance to the new faculty member are not in widespread use among the small colleges of the region. The practices reviewed are thought to be of considerable value, but for various reasons they are restricted to a handful of institutions. Even in these few institutions it is highly unlikely that the new faculty member typically receives more help than he needs.

All these procedures for extending "assistance," it should be recognized, depend for their success on the total atmosphere or climate in which they are implemented. Most deans would agree that "fair treatment, good working conditions, and a feeling that they are needed and wanted" go far toward making new faculty members more effective citizens of the college community and more effective practitioners in the classroom. Finally, as implied earlier, the process of assisting a *professional* person must take into account the need for independent thought and development on his part. A dean emphasized this point as follows:

> Good men, to grow intellectually, must be encouraged in every wise and worthy way by officers who recognize the teacher's deeply felt need for professional self respect. The individualists who are often the strongest teachers are often most sensitive to administrative proposals or to any criticism, real or imagined, from superiors in the structure of administration . . . [and] *good faculty* people resent an excessively paternal attitude as much as they resent neglect.

Professional Improvement

Quality of instruction and professional growth should be enhanced by procedures which afford the ambitious and motivated faculty member an opportunity for replenishment of ideas, further graduate study, a continuing program of scholarly study or research, and for association with colleagues from other campuses. Among the procedures included on the general questionnaire, six appear to be most relevant for these general purposes, as follows: (a) *financial assistance to the faculty for further graduate study,* (b) *adjustment of teaching loads of individuals periodically to allow time for research and writing,* (c) *funds for the publication of faculty writing,* (d) *annual financial assistance for at least half the faculty to attend professional meetings,* (e) *sabbatical year leave with at least half salary,* and (f) *a functioning teacher exchange.*

It is noteworthy that five of these procedures are in greater use among High-IRS institutions than among Low-IRS institutions. As compared to Low-IRS institutions, *institutions high in reputational strength more frequently make time and money available for scholarly research, faculty publication, attendance at professional meetings, and similar activities.*

Financing Further Graduate Study

Almost two thirds of the small colleges in this study provide some financial assistance for graduate study of faculty members, and more than 90 per cent of colleges which provide such assistance report that it is of considerable value for faculty development. Interviews indicate that this practice is thought to (a) contribute to the general improvement of the individual receiving assistance, (b) help the institution to retain faculty members, and (c) help the institution to recruit faculty members. *In the majority of cases where this practice is followed, the faculty member receiving assistance must agree to return to the college after graduate study.* The amount of financial assistance varies considerably among colleges—ranging from grants of $100 to one year's salary, with the latter amount typically not being allowed except in conjunction with a sabbatical leave. Where special inquiry was made, it was indicated that at least one faculty member had benefited from this practice in the two previous years.

Among those visited, the college which appeared to have worked most diligently at financing further graduate study of its faculty had the largest proportion of doctorates in critical areas. The plan for financing assistance had been followed consistently for several years, length of service of faculty was high on the average, and the college had built its program around a faculty developed in this manner.

Arrangements for financing grants for further graduate study involving several institutions are of particular interest. Texas Baptist colleges, for example, award fellowships for faculty members to complete the doctorate, which provides $175 monthly for unmarried faculty and $225 monthly for married faculty on a nine-month basis. Graduated amounts are available for shorter periods of study. Faculty members receiving assistance, made possible by a grant of $47,000 approved by the Texas Baptist executive board, must contract to continue at the college for twice the total time of study under the fellowship.

Time for Research and Writing

More than one half (55 per cent) of the High-IRS institutions but less than one fourth (22 per cent) of the Low-IRS group report that they *adjust teaching loads of individuals periodically to allow time for research and writing.* In both groups the procedure is considered valuable by "users."

It is necessary to recognize that the small colleges surveyed vary widely with respect to the matter of emphasis on faculty research. Both proponents and opponents of emphasis on research and writing by college faculty agree that such activities add to the existing body of knowledge and that prestige comes to institutions where there are productive scholars. These considerations aside, however, it is imperative that all recognize an equally sound argument for "research" whether published or unpublished, namely, that inquiry into something of concern is a necessary condition for keeping the faculty member active and intellectually "alive."

Some colleges have emphasized development by faculty members of plans for professional growth which entail programs of research and study. Once faculty members propose such plans, college officials assist in securing necessary financial support and take such plans into account in development of schedules for individual faculty members. At Washington and Lee University, for example, faculty members are encouraged to develop five-year plans for professional growth. The administration provides assistance by approaching foundations for support of certain faculty projects; grants already available help to finance others. One gift, of $100,000, will be used over a four year period to help create incentive for research and studies designed to help professors improve their teaching effectiveness.

From interviews with faculty members, it appears that many of them have research interests centering on problems of "higher education"—as represented in the small college—and that, in general, they place more emphasis on development of the teaching role than of the research role. In fact, so much has been written and said about faculty members who are "research oriented" as opposed to "teaching oriented" that it was somewhat surprising to find so few of the former in the interview sample. The emphasis on teaching and on research relevant to improvement of teaching or improvement of the curriculum of the small college may be a consequence of self-selection factors in the process of faculty recruitment for the small colleges of the region. Although some of those joining the small college faculty may be highly specialized—the university graduate school tends to get most of these—judging from faculty members interviewed, they know that in such institutions primary emphasis is placed on teaching and they tend to feel that they can accept this type of situation. The person who is completely "research oriented" or even one who may wish to do it "half-time" is not likely to choose (or to remain long at) a college with primary emphasis on teaching and with limited library and laboratory facilities.

Despite this trend, however, it is evident that many faculty members are interested in research and study which is relevant to the process of improving teaching and improving institutional programs—as well as traditional research and scholarship. *More systematic attention to the problem of developing the latent research interests of faculty members and more assistance for those with active research projects*—for example, *by making time and resources available, even though in limited amounts—are major needs in the small college.* It is to the advantage of the small college that its institutional preoccupation with teaching enhances its potential for finding ways to relate the "research" interests of the faculty to the job of improving both the faculty member and the teaching process.

Funds for Publication of Faculty Writing

Funds for publication of scholarly articles or monographs are available in only about 16 per cent of all institutions, but 26 per cent of the High-IRS group as compared to only about 3 per cent of the Low-IRS group provide such funds.

Most of the colleges involved do not have a campus press, though some contract with university presses for publication. A few colleges include books among publications which they will finance, while others consider only papers, bulletins, or monographs. Tift College, for example, started a procedure in 1958 to provide for publication and distribution of three faculty papers per year. A Publications Committee established criteria for the guidance of those who might wish to prepare articles, and the publication agenda was on a "first-come, first-served" basis.

Financing Attendance at Professional Meetings

More than three fourths of all colleges surveyed—some 84 per cent of the High-IRS and 73 per cent of the Low-IRS group—reported that some financial assistance was provided annually for at least half the faculty to attend regional or national professional meetings. Forty per cent of those reporting this practice indicated that they pay the total expenses to at least one meeting, and that from 45 to 60 per cent of the faculty attended meetings with financial support during the academic year 1959-60. The value of this procedure is affirmed by a majority of administrators and almost all respondents (some 97 per cent) who indicated that their institutions made some provision for financing attendance expressed the feeling that attendance contributed to the improvement of the faculty member.

Sabbatical Leave

Reported by only about 16 per cent of Low-IRS institutions, provision for *sabbatical leaves with at least half salary* is made by about 45 per cent of High-IRS institutions. The value of the sabbatical leave for faculty development is emphasized by 94 per cent of High-IRS and by 80 per cent of the Low-IRS institutions reporting a sabbatical provision.

Of the colleges visited, seven provided for sabbaticals and *the faculty members interviewed in these institutions gave this practice the highest possible rating—with respect to no other procedure were faculty members so united in their endorsement.* Deans interviewed tended to agree with faculty members that this practice was of great value. Of colleges involved in more intensive analysis, about one half grant a half year with the normal salary for that period. The remaining institutions have varied arrangements but in no instance was provision made for more than half-salary. A faculty member is usually required to present a plan of improvement in order to be approved for a sabbatical leave.

This was one of the few procedures with respect to which publicly supported and privately supported institutions were characterized by some difference in approach. For example, 42 per cent of the public institutions report provisions for sabbaticals while only 28 per cent of private institutions do so. Among privately-supported institutions, *the larger and stronger institutions tend to provide sabbaticals, and the conditions and expectations regarding the practice are clearly understood by faculty members.* In some publicly supported institutions (and in some private colleges as well) these conditions and expectations are less clearly defined. Conditions of leave are often couched in such relative terms as to make them somewhat ambiguous. One manual states, for example, that a faculty member may be recommended by the president for a "leave with compensation," but if "the applicant's work cannot be handled by other faculty members or if funds are not available for the employment of a substitute, the President will be justified in refusing. . ." The sabbatical seems to be an "iffy" proposition in a number of the small publicly supported colleges, and the conditions for leave are not always satisfactory—

e.g., leave at half salary for one year but *only* if a replacement can be employed *for the other half* of the salary in question. Said one faculty member "[the half salary] invitation to starvation [is of value to the family man] only if he can find a remunerative project, or a disposition in his wife to subsidize him."

Relatively few of the colleges seem to have initiated a sabbatical program as a full-fledged operation. Rather, the sabbatical programs seem to have emerged, for example, from short leaves for further study or special projects, with some small subsidy from the college. In some places, the leave idea had its origin in the willingness of faculty members to share the work load and take turns at leaves by agreeing to absorb summer loads of a different faculty member each year so that he might be able to take a short leave.

There seems to be little question regarding the value of the sabbatical in places where it has become a well-defined, clearly understood facet of institutional life. *Many institutions, however, need to examine carefully the utility of a leave program which is so hedged and conditioned as to make it a source of friction rather than an impetus to faculty development and improvement.*

Teacher Exchange Programs

About four per cent of small colleges *reported* programs of teacher exchange. Follow-up on the initial reports, however, revealed that *none of the colleges* was actually participating in an active program, on an inter-institutional basis, for the regular *exchange* of teachers. Some had, for example, Fulbright professors or Whitney professors but no exchange program was identified. Needless to say, the presence of visiting professors may give the faculty a valuable experience. It is probable, however, that more value would accrue to the small colleges of the region if regular faculty members could participate in an exchange program.

Other Procedures

In addition to the procedures considered above, the adoption of honors programs, honors seminars, and other activities for the superior student often provide stimulation to the faculty. It is only natural that many members of the faculty would tend to be attracted to the more able students and would find in such students a particular challenge.

One college has developed a program for sending its faculty abroad in relays, the professors paying only one third the cost. Wofford

College, with initial assistance from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, began such a program in the summer of 1961.

Summary and Discussion

Despite the frequently expressed feeling that improvement of teaching effectiveness and professional growth are key objectives of faculty development, there is little evidence of vigorous, imaginative, and sustained efforts to facilitate such improvement or growth. Of the 22 specific practices included in the basic questionnaire, for example, ten are reported to be in use by less than 40 per cent of the colleges *and seven of the ten least frequently reported practices are among the 15 treated in this chapter.*

Systematic visitation of classes by administrative officers or other faculty members is reported by less than 15 per cent of the colleges; only about one fifth of the colleges *reduce load for new teachers during their first year* with the institution; less than one third assign *an experienced teacher to work with a first-year teacher in developing instructional techniques* or provide a working program of *sabbatical year leaves with at least half salary;* and, less than one half of the colleges report an *active faculty committee charged with improving instruction,* an *organized series of faculty discussions of college teaching,* a *series of visiting lecturers to discuss problems of higher education, adjustment in teaching loads of individuals periodically to allow time for research and writing,* or *funds for the publication of faculty writing.*

It is worthy of note that stronger colleges (High-IRS) more frequently reduce teacher load for new faculty members, have a faculty committee for improving instruction, and make load adjustments for research and writing. This suggests greater faculty responsibility for improving instruction and relatively greater opportunity and incentive both for improving teaching and for doing research in such institutions as compared to Low-IRS colleges.

It is encouraging that more than three fourths of the small colleges of the region seem to be recognizing the potential value of attendance of faculty members at professional meetings as reflected in the provision of some financial assistance and almost two thirds are providing financial assistance to some faculty members for further graduate study. The professional meeting may play a particularly vital role in keeping the small-college faculty member in touch with new developments and in providing a welcome opportunity to discuss his specialty with "kindred spirits." Moreover, in three fourths of the colleges there are *some* departmental conferences on problems of teaching; in about two thirds, library materials on higher education are available; and, in more than half the institutions, according to reports of deans, provision is made for *giving first-year faculty members continuing personal assistance in teaching problems,* although such assistance apparently is not provided on any systematic basis.

From the evidence available, it is reasonable to conclude that *direct efforts* (a) to provide advice, counsel, assistance, or "instruction" to new and inexperienced teachers, (b) to observe classroom teaching for purposes of evaluation or "instruction," or (c) to involve the faculty as a group in the active consideration of problems related to the improvement of instruction are more conspicuous by their absence than by their presence. There is some irony in the fact that so many small colleges which typically stress "teaching" and which have some reason to feel that the graduate schools may not be doing an adequate job in "preparing" teachers for a college setting, are doing so little to insure that new and inexperienced teachers are given at least a modicum of direct assistance and instruction or to establish meaningful evaluation procedures. Perhaps this should not be so astonishing, however, for as Barzun[3] has so aptly noted,

> college teaching is the oddest profession in the world . . . [It is] a profession in which training does not prepare for the main task, and in the absence of that preparation does not provide apprenticeship; in which after this double lack there is no clear judgment of the work done, and in which the superiors of the newcomer do not care whether he succeeds in the task that he performs. They judge something entirely different.

The small colleges of the region have a responsibility and an opportunity to change this image—unless, of course, oddness is equated with goodness.

---

[3] Jacques Barzun, in *Expanding Resources for College Teaching* (Charles G. Dobbins, Editor), American Council on Education Studies, Series I, No. 60, Volume XX, October, 1956 (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1956) p. 50.

CHAPTER VI

Helping Faculty Members Maintain A Sense of Security and Morale

FACULTY MORALE is a thing of many facets which may be influenced, for better or for worse, by a variety of individual and situational variables. It is certainly affected, for example, by the presence or absence in a given situation of appropriate recognition of faculty accomplishments, a system of "rewards" which is consistent with the needs and values of the majority of faculty members, and a climate which permits freedom of thought, action, and expression. Moreover, to the extent that the institutional context is conducive to the development within faculty members of a sense of security—which, like morale, is a highly complex variable—the morale of the faculty is likely to be enhanced.

Contacts with administrators in this study reveal their deep concern with the problem of building a "good spirit" among the faculty, and their recognition of the special importance of this problem for the small college although they sometimes tend to construe the problem somewhat narrowly by equating "good spirit" with "good salaries." This is an understandable tendency which may reflect an overriding concern with present or anticipated financial problems, limited endowments in many instances, perception of the college as being the "buyer" in a "seller's" market, and the not infrequent loss of particularly able faculty members to institutions paying higher salaries.

While it is of crucial importance for an administration to recognize that even a "Mr. Chips" may have aspirations for personal, professional, and financial advancement, *it is equally important to recognize that faculty morale cannot be "purchased"*—that salary increases alone do not insure "good spirit," though they may be necessary for the improvement of morale in many instances. Morale may shift with changes in a variety of conditions not directly related to salaries, and administrators should be particularly alert to types of administrative behavior that might affect morale.

Shifts in administrative behavior or attitude toward institutional concerns—or, what is more important, faculty perception thereof—tend to represent important potential influences on morale. For example, a fluctuating and unstable condition in student enrollment or in financial support for a liberal arts college in a sizeable population center may lead administrators to consider enlargement of curriculum to include more courses deemed attractive to high school graduates with "vocational" orientation. Faculty members may perceive such consideration as indicative of planned departure from the established liberal arts tradition with which they are closely identified—an effort to forsake important values and to embrace a course of expediency. The affect on morale is highly predictable!

Identification of the administration as being the sole "promoter" of the college may become a factor in morale. Once the administration, or a particular administrator, becomes identified with the development of a particular image of "growth" or "progress" in the college, the maintenance of that image becomes crucial. Any shift of conditions bearing on the image is first perceived *by the administration or the administrator* as threatening, and appropriate action must be taken—action which may have unexpected consequences requiring still further action, all of which may affect morale. For example, increases in tuition may be accompanied by a decrease in enrollment, a phenomenon which is inconsistent with the "growth image." The administration—say, the president—may urge and rationalize a policy for admitting students with somewhat lower qualifications. The faculty sees this as a threat to "programs of excellence," morale is not improved! Or, if the president perceives the difficulty in such a course, he might urge a scholarship program to compensate for tuition increases. This will require funds, so a local campaign is started which yields, in addition to some funds, the finding that the college is felt to be a "poor citizen of the community" by prospective donors. The faculty is urged to take a more active role in the community—a narrow role, in the minds of some faculty members, consisting mainly in having faculty more frequently "join, speak, buy, and worship."

"We would accept a simple and forthright statement," said one faculty member, "that faculty members will be asked to undertake tasks to help raise money but we dislike the talking down to faculty to try to convince them that all should enjoy these activities, that they will be especially benefited by them, and that no other service is more valuable to the college and community." Thus, various decisions and actions may set in motion a chain of events ultimately detrimental to faculty morale.

The foregoing examples point up the fact that not all the problems of building faculty morale should be attributed to low salaries! *Failure of the administration to sense the need for other assurances of worth and value, to provide a climate of freedom, and to give faculty members a sense of full participation in the college can have unfortunate consequences.*

In view of its complexity, it is understandable that deans interviewed felt that no general solution to the problem of building morale and developing a sense of security within the faculty could be written. And it should be evident that the eight types of provisions or specific practices discussed in this section, and listed below, are simply suggestive of broader areas of concern:

(a) distribution of a salary schedule that clearly shows opportunities for financial advancement,

(b) provisions for social activities to introduce new faculty members,

(c) adjustment in teaching loads of individuals to allow off-campus consulting or lecturing,

(d) private offices for all faculty members,

(e) provisions for non-professional aides and assistants for routines related to teaching,

(f) provisions to assure faculty members freedom of action, thought, and expression.

(g) provisions for stimulating the flow of creative ideas and suggestions for improving the college, and

(h) provisions for periodic faculty evaluation of the program of faculty development.

Six of these provisions or practices are reported by more than one half of all small colleges, ranging downward from a high of some 82 per cent (provisions for introductory social activities) to a low of 18 per cent (load adjustments for off-campus consultation or lecturing). Except for provision of non-professional aides and assistants, and introductory social activities, the provisions or practices are rated as of more than limited value by from two thirds to over nine tenths of respondents.

Recognition and Reward

Talking with faculty members convinces one that the "best unkept secret" in small colleges is who gets what salary! The *efforts* at secrecy regarding this subject often create a sense of uneasiness, however, and sometimes lead to distrust of the administration. *Especially is this likely to be true if there is no recognized plan for evaluating faculty performance and no clearly understood bases for determining salary increments.*[1]

In the small college, "raises" often appear to be matters of presidential decision and even if the faculty have great admiration for the president they may have little confidence in his ability to evaluate their work—his background, for example, often is not that of classroom teaching. And, in the absence of reasonably clear understanding of factors governing salary increments, the faculty may assume that they come as the result of *feeding the ego of certain administrators,* or that certain elements of "haggling" or "horsetrading" must be introduced. Not infrequently, salary increments gained in the latter fashion lead to undesirable consequences. One young professor interviewed, for example, indicated that he was quite happy until he learned that others with similar experience and training were receiving higher salaries. After some "haggling" he got his salary increase—plus concern over what he could have lost had he not "haggled," dissatisfaction at having "haggled," and disillusionment with the ethics of an administration that encouraged it!

One step toward alleviation of this undesirable state of affairs is the cooperative development and discussion of a salary schedule that clearly shows opportunities for financial advancement. Slightly more than one half of the small colleges (52.2 per cent) report *distribution* of a salary schedule. More than 80 per cent of institutions which employ it report that the practice is of more than limited value.

---

[1] In a recently conducted survey of conditions of work of about 2000 faculty and administrators in 970 institutions, ratings of "importance" to the respondents and "presence" in the respondents' working situations were obtained for each of 53 items. Among the eight items found to be above average in "importance" but *below average in "presence"* was the following:

> "The basis upon which my work is evaluated is known to me and I know how I stand."

[See Louise A. Wood, "Conditions of Work of Faculty and Administrators," in John W. Gustad, Editor, *Faculty Utilization and Retention* (Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960).]

Those colleges that attempt to show opportunities for financial advancement do so in terms of such criteria as level of degree attained, length of service, and effectiveness of teaching. Problems involved in assessing the effectiveness of teaching have been noted previously, and degree level and length of service are clearly more objective criteria than is "teaching effectiveness." While it is true that a schedule based on these criteria may encourage inertia in some faculty members, it is also true that the specification of rewards for tenure may make the future more definite for all. Some 25 colleges which reported a salary schedule were studied in some detail and a variety of approaches could be described. Two may serve for illustrative purposes: Jacksonville University provides increments on a ratio basis for each rank—for each dollar increment given an instructor, professors get two dollars and a half. Carson-Newman College indicates minimum degree requirements for each rank, starting and maximum salary for each rank, and expectancy for movement from starting to maximum salary with increasing tenure in a given position and with additional service to the institution.

Careful examination of the situation suggests that in many instances salary schedules exist but the *conditions for advancement in salary and in rank are, at best, somewhat ambiguously stated.* Moreover, knowledge of "amounts" in various categories is not as important to the individual faculty member as *knowledge of his own position in the schedule and his own prospects for advancement.* In general, there is little to indicate that administrators of small colleges have displayed much creativity in developing and using the salary schedule.

Load Adjustments for Off-Campus Consulting or Lecturing

According to interviews with deans, pursuit by faculty members of off-campus assignments as consultants (to business, industry, or community agencies) or as lecturers is considered to be highly worthwhile providing, of course, that preoccupation with such matters is not so great as to result in loss of perspective regarding teaching and other campus responsibilities. At the same time, only about 18 per cent of the respondents indicate that their institutions provide for "adjustment in loads of individuals to allow off-campus consulting or lecturing."

Consultation and lecturing provide additional income for those involved, of course. Deans tended to feel that such activities by faculty members contribute to the prestige of the institution as well as to the morale and reputation of the faculty.

Introductory Social Activities

Aside from their contribution to "observation of the amenities," social activities to introduce new faculty members may provide a basis for establishing contacts and friendships which have more lasting significance in the college community and in the community at large. More than 80 per cent of colleges report provisions of such activities. *Interestingly, more than 95 per cent of the High-IRS group report provisions of this kind as compared to only about 76 per cent of the Low-IRS group.*

For somewhat obvious reasons, provisions for social activities are not placed uppermost in value in the total context of provisions or practices for faculty development (less than one third of the respondents rated these activities as "among the most important"), but they are nonetheless an *accepted* aspect of institutional life in the majority of small colleges.

Special Recognition of Faculty Achievement

Some small colleges have devices for publicizing the accomplishments of faculty members—professional activities, research projects undertaken or completed, community service. In addition to normal channels for the release of information to the public, summaries of work done by various faculty members are provided by some institutions. For example, the University of Chattanooga publishes annually a brochure on "Professional, Community, and Creative Activities of the University of Chattanooga Faculty."

Devices of this kind help to reinforce the inclinations of faculty members to undertake significant and creative activies.

Working Facilities and Arrangements

Previous studies have pointed up the significance for faculty members of such factors as private office space, secretarial assistance (and other sub-professional aides) and fringe benefits.[2]

Almost 60 per cent of the colleges in this study, with only slight differentiation between Low-IRS and High-IRS groups, indicate that private offices are provided for all faculty members and that provisions are made for non-professional aides and assistants for routines related to teaching. Far greater value is assigned to private offices than to the provision of assistants, however. *Deans felt that arrangements for private offices definitely enable faculty members to be more productive.*

---

[2] See, for example, T. C. Clark, "Conditions of Work for College Faculty and Administrators," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 48, October, 1959, pp. 59-61, and John W. Gustad, *The*

Aides and assistants—primarily secretarial, and typically not full-time—for teaching-related routines were more highly endorsed by faculty members than by deans. It seems likely that efforts made to provide better office facilities and more secretarial and clerical assistance for faculty members would yield dividends in morale and productivity which would more than outweigh some of the costs involved.

Establishing a Climate for Growth

It is improbable that morale could be high or that a sense of security could be developed in an atmosphere in which faculty members are not assured of freedom of thought, action, and expression. Moreover, faculty development requires faculty participation. Meaningful participation is contingent upon a climate of freedom, implying, in addition to traditional concepts of academic freedom, interaction of creative ideas and suggestions for improvement of the college and active faculty concern with institutional programs for faculty development.

About 70 per cent of the respondents to the general questionnaire reported that their institutions had *provisions to assure faculty members of freedom of action, thought, and expression*—some 75 per cent of the High-IRS (top half) and 68 per cent of the Low-IRS group (bottom half). This is an area in which formal procedures are much less significant than the "context" in which those procedures have been developed. Nevertheless, it is of interest to note that most of the institutions reporting provisions for "freedom" sent along copies of statements on academic freedom, many of which were patterned after the well-known 1940 statement of the American Association of University Professors. One interesting and somewhat different statement on academic freedom referred to freedom for faculty development, citing freedom to grow professionally and free-

---

Career Decisions of College Teachers (Atlanta, Georgia: The Southern Regional Education Board, 1960).

While consideration of fringe benefits—retirement provisions, health insurance, housing provisions, etc.,—which are of great importance to the faculty has not been a primary concern of this study, the importance of such provisions should not be overlooked. Certain interesting provisions for financing retirement and housing are included in the description of faculty development at Birmingham-Southern College (see Appendix A).

dom to change one's job for professional advancement as integral aspects of academic freedom (see Appendix A, exhibit for Clark College).

Some colleges indicated in their reports that they encouraged the discussion and consideration of controversial issues. "We must be the freest academic community in the world!" said one dean. "Believe me, discussion about the most controversial issue is not only tolerated but welcomed. I have never known a professor to be called down, much less criticized, for exercising his freedom of expression. Our governing bodies interfere in no way with what we discuss. Indeed, we rather think the discussion of controversial issues releases energy and contributes to understanding."

There is reason to believe, however, that not all institutions can report encouragement of free discussion. Indeed some "liberal arts" colleges fail to provide that assurance of the spirit of free inquiry which the term "liberal arts" implies and which faculty members need. One faculty member referred to the situation in a college in which he had previously taught, as follows: "I was a searcher for divine truth. They wanted me to defend what *they* interpreted to be established truth." It is difficult to have a spirit of free inquiry if a college expects unquestioning defense of certain dogma or prohibits inquiry into certain questions or subjects. That a college has a right to define its role so as to permit defense of certain conceptions, philosophies, and doctrines is not in question, but limitations on inquiry and discussion inhibit the range of intellectual examination which is basic to academic freedom and the advancement of understanding.

Such limitations are not peculiar to denominational institutions, of course. Limitations of discussion or publication of material having potential political repercussions may be found in the public sector of higher education. In some institutions "the hand of orthodoxy rests heavily," as one dean noted, and the climate for intellectual growth among students as well as faculty is poor. However, the high percentage of small colleges reporting provisions for assuring freedom of inquiry is most encouraging.

Almost two thirds (63.5 per cent) of the small colleges report that they have provisions for *stimulating the flow of creative ideas and suggestions for improving the college*, but less than two fifths report provisions for *periodic faculty evaluation of the program of faculty development*. The low percentage of institutions reporting the latter type of provision may be due in part to the fact that "programs" for faculty development are quite unstructured and not formally designated as such. Thus, while faculty members may assist in the evaluation of certain practices and policies which bear on faculty development, there is no "program," per se, to be evaluated.

Several ways of eliciting ideas and suggestions for improving the college and of encouraging faculty participation in the development and review of policies and practices affecting their professional development may be noted. In most instances procedures reported utilized regular administrative organization as a channel for communication of ideas and for evaluation.

One approach reported by several colleges involved use of questionnaires and survey techniques to assess faculty attitudes and to secure their judgment of institutional policies and procedures. At Louisiana College, for example, the dean made a survey of the faculty to determine the major sources of satisfaction and frustration in the area of college teaching. The results of this survey served as a background for consideration of ways of improving conditions for teaching on the campus. The use of devices such as questionnaires provides for a formal assessment of faculty attitudes and offers a means for securing their evaluation of institutional policies and practices. The role of such techniques in providing what may be termed "formal feedback" to the administration, to supplement the informal impressions gained in the normal course of daily events, is not fully realized in many small colleges. Reliance is placed, in too many instances, entirely on personalized procedures.[3]

The faculty "retreat" in some colleges provides an opportunity for the constructive consideration of ideas for college improvement and for discussion of matters of concern to the faculty and the administration. At Davidson College, the entire board of trustees join with faculty and administration.

---

[3] The need for using formal techniques of measurement and assessment to supplement informal and personal procedures has been argued by Whitla, as follows:

> What a college administrator needs is a feedback system . . . Why do we so seldom find such a formal system in operation in colleges? First, we know that informal feedback such as [that provided by talking with students or faculty members in the normal course of events] is both inexpensive and highly sensitive. In comparison with the sensitivity of a professor or dean . . . many of our measurement techniques are clumsy indeed. [However,] the shortcomings of the personal . . . system are that generally information comes from those whose paths cross in the normal course of events—which can be a highly biased sample—and the accuracy of comparison and synthesis depends upon the memory of the person evaluating. Also, because it is personal, it can contain personal biases in spite of all the good intentions of the evaluator.

Dean K. Whitla, "Measurement and Educational Policy," in *Institutional Research on College Students,* Kenneth M. Wilson, Editor (Atlanta, Georgia: The Southern Regional Education Board, 1962) pp. 72-73.

Summary and Discussion

Many administrators tend to construe the problem of building "good morale" rather narrowly by equating "good morale" with good *salaries*, but as we have seen this conceptualization of the problem is not adequate. Moreover, the various practices and types of provisions in this chapter merely sample the problem. It is, however, most interesting to note that of the eight provisions or practices involved, *six are more frequently reported by "stronger" institutions*. For example, provisions for assuring freedom of thought, expression, and action; stimulating a flow of creative ideas about the college; and for introducing new faculty members socially are reported more frequently by High-IRS than by Low-IRS colleges. In addition, more High-IRS colleges report periodic faculty evaluation of faculty development.

Included among the basic elements in any conceptualization of the factors involved in developing morale within a faculty would be (a) appropriate recognition of faculty accomplishments, (b) a system of rewards which is consistent with the needs and values of faculty members, and (c) a climate which permits freedom of thought, action, and expression. Faculty members must be convinced that their jobs are understood and respected and that the system of rewards—salary increases, promotions, establishment of tenure, and other awards—operates in such a way as to distribute fairly the resources available in terms of clearly understood and cooperatively defined "rules of the game."

All colleges must recognize that freedom of thought, expression and inquiry are basic not only to "good morale" but to "good" education. Without continuing assurances that such freedoms will be guarded zealously by the administration, the faculty will have little sense of security and the morale is likely to deteriorate. The fact that so many of the region's small colleges report concern for this freedom is most encouraging, although in some institutions, both public and private, "the hand of orthodoxy rests heavily."

The importance of good salaries is obvious. However, faculty members are also concerned with *how their performance is to be evaluated* and "how they stand" in respect to available salary schedules. More attention must be given to the problem of clarifying and communicating institutional expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities and to the cooperative development of an appropriate system of evaluating and rewarding "good performance." For example, if emphasis is to be on *classroom teaching* this should be reflected in the rewards system in effect on campus as well as in statements appearing in the college catalog.

That many faculty members do not tend to feel certain of institutional expectations, of the criteria used in evaluating their work, or of their current status in respect to these criteria has been noted. Such uncertainty is not conducive to "good morale." Current efforts at clarification of "rules" for promotion, tenure, etc. leave much to be desired.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

CHAPTER VII

Reflections and Impressions

At one college characterized by a high percentage of the faculty with the doctorate, low faculty turnover, and relatively high salaries—where grants for research are available, where adjustments may be made in teaching load to permit time for research, and where attendance at professional meetings is liberally financed—the dean reported, "I see no really difficult problems in faculty development for us here." At another college, the dean reported that his institution placed essentially exclusive emphasis on the employment of individuals who were mature and professionally competent, adding:

> The omission of formal projects for faculty development is, therefore, a matter of deliberate policy, not of negligence. After all, we are confronted with a nearly absolute dilemma; if the instructor is mature and professionally competent he will not need such programs; if he is not he cannot profit from them.

Some college administrators tend to perceive few problems related to the recruitment and continued professional development of faculty members because they are at institutions where there is a climate which attracts individuals of promise and ability—and where many of the "procedures" for faculty development considered in this survey, without being formally conceptualized as such, are characteristic features of the college. And, of course, many faculty members in some measure continue to grow in effectiveness in the multiple roles of college teaching regardless of the context of their employment. The relatively heavy emphasis on "recruitment" noted earlier in this report reflects the elemental importance of getting "good material" and, as implied in the second statement quoted above, some administrators tend to equate "faculty development" with recruitment of "already developed" individuals as faculty members!

Many deans of small colleges in the South, however, are approaching a conscious realization that *a laissez faire position regarding the process of faculty development after employment is neither logical nor adequate for meeting the very real problems of the small colleges in improving the qualifications and competencies of their faculties in the years ahead.* Pressures for institutional expansion and corresponding pressures for the enlargement and the improvement of the faculty are causing many administrators, as one dean put it, "to feel the need for a more systematic approach to the problems of [faculty] orientation and development."

Nature of Current Approaches

While there are activities in these colleges directed toward establishing or improving approaches to faculty development, these activities are, in the main, uncoordinated and lacking in creativity. As we have seen, practically all the small colleges of the region are using some of the procedures or practices under consideration in this study and administrators and faculty members alike tend to think of the majority of these procedures as being of more than limited utility and value. There is extensive use of certain procedures, yes. But often reliance is placed on a limited number of relatively routine procedures and emphasis tends to be placed on procedures related to the process of orienting faculty members to the institution—an important but limited aspect of the process of development. Furthermore, administrators tended to feel that colleges were more successful in their use of such limited and structured procedures—e.g., pre-employment orientation, information giving, induction procedures, handbooks—than in dealing with longer-range, and more fundamental problems of facilitating and encouraging professional growth and improvement in teaching effectiveness, or those involved in providing adequate incentives and rewards.

Moreover, the varied constellations of practices now employed by small colleges in their efforts at faculty orientation and in-service development do not constitute planned programs designed to facilitate a clearly conceptualized process of personal and professional improvement within an institutional context. While a given practice—a sabbatical-year leave program, subsidy for faculty graduate study, etc.—may be useful without reference to its relationship to a "program" for faculty development, it is of some significance that region-wide the current institutional efforts at faculty development do not tend to be "programmatic" either in operation or in concept—i.e., characterized by a distinctive, well-articulated philosophy, a reasonably explicit set of objectives derived from a distinctive conceptualization of the important aspects of development and a relevant set of administratively supported developmental activities.

Divergent Concepts of Development

The connotations of the expression, "faculty development," are not explicit and there is no consensus regarding the essential or major aspects of development. As a consequence, one finds some instances in which only very limited segments of faculty life are considered relevant areas for "development" and others in which consideration might be given to almost the total life of the faculty member! Furthermore, some administrators were of the opinion that faculty development means "indoctrination" or "regimentation." Some truisms were cited in this regard, for instance, "all persons grow in different ways and we do not wish to force a pattern." Many thought of faculty development as representing mainly a process of orientation, while others stressed such factors as faculty leaves, salary schedules and increments, and research grants in their conceptualizations of the term. Actually, few persons involved in this study tended to think of faculty development as involving a range of *interrelated* developmental activities.

Smallness and close association were thought of by some deans as constituting special assets of the small college in creating an atmosphere for "development." These individuals implied that understanding and growth are less to be cultivated than "caught"—through personal contacts in an informal and permissive atmosphere in which faculty members could exchange ideas and receive help from colleagues. Perhaps typical of this general orientation was a tendency to place major responsibility for development with the individual—e.g., "Intellectual development depends primarily upon the individual, his energies, his heart's desire [in availing himself of growth opportunities afforded by an academic environment]"—or to cite the opportunity for deans and department heads in small colleges to have personal conferences with faculty members, this especially in view of the strong personal ties in the small group.

Divergence of view regarding the elements and objectives of faculty development, not to mention the types of procedures which should be instituted by a college, is due in part, of course, to the markedly different circumstances of different colleges. The diversity which is characteristic of the group of small colleges involved in this study—in financial resources, reputation for strength and accomplishment of educational purpose, general educational qualifications of faculty members, enrollment and faculty size, etc.—has already been noted. It is to be expected that an administrator's perception of the nature and the magnitude of the problems of "faculty development" will be conditioned by institutional circumstances as well as by his own preconceptions and predilections. At some small colleges, for example, administrators can point to the major portion of the faculty as approaching the quality desired and they usually have a fair idea of what the others might be able to do individually—with college assistance—to reach a desirable level of competence. Like the institution cited at the beginning of this chapter, these colleges tend to attract persons with a combination of the highest degrees and recognized professional accomplishment; and, by virtue of institutional resources and a favorable institutional reputation for strength, they look toward the cultivation of individual competence and professional growth. At other colleges, however, while administrators may have a concept of the kind of faculty members they would *like* to attract, they must settle for less. These colleges must face reality, take those faculty members they can get, and work with them in what may be quite literally a fight for the survival of the college. For such institutions the problem of assembling "next year's faculty" is often paramount. There may be efforts—sometimes successful but seldom completely rewarding—directed toward inducting and assimilating faculty members from housewives or persons retired from other professions.

Administrative Influence and Responsibility

Differences in institutional circumstances and resources make for differences in emphasis but it is also true that the existence of particular patterns of faculty development procedures in a college appears to be related to the special interests and concerns of administrators. Almost by definition faculty development procedures exist because administrators have reasons for instituting them. Moreover, evidence that the extent and nature of institutional procedures for development are related to administrative concern was found in colleges where the president, the dean, or both, were new or were in the process of leaving. In such instances, some administratively supported procedures were in process of change and some which had not existed were being instituted although the resources of the colleges remained constant. Moreover, among the twenty institutions visited, those with more clearly defined plans for faculty development tended to be those *in which both the president and the dean had been identified with the institution for a relatively long period of time*. Clearly, administrative attitude, ability, and tenure are often the decisive factors in determining the direction of faculty development at a given institution.

In this context, it is important to recognize that the success of any program for faculty development—or of any facet of such a program—depends in large measure upon the ability of administrators to relate procedures employed to the current needs and aspirations of faculty members. We have already seen that administrators and interviewed faculty members, while giving relatively general endorsement to specific practices employed by their respective institutions, did not agree regarding the relative importance and value of practices. Administrative concern, moreover, springs—in theory—directly from identification with the institution as a whole and is motivated by a desire to improve the college—to meet institutional needs. Not all faculty members, it should be emphasized, can be said to share this same pattern of identification and motivation (though, it goes without saying that the movement of the majority of faculty members toward the establishment of such a pattern is a major goal of faculty development) and any administrative initiative predicated on the assumption that such common motivation obtains is likely to be thwarted.

It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that growth takes place best in places where thought, attention, effort, and resources are applied to the development of an atmosphere for improvement. Administrative concern must be evidenced by a continued, active commitment to the goal not only of improving the faculty but also of making the college into a more hospitable setting for improvement.

Attention must be given to a variety of factors, both tangible and intangible, which affect the quality of faculty-administration interaction. Salary schedules, economic security, and general conditions of work are, of course, extremely important. But faculty members also want to know that the administration has an interest in their work that grows from an understanding of the educational process and the key role of the faculty in that process. Faculty participation in institutional planning can help build morale, encourage faculty support for institutional goals, and provide general developmental experience, but all these positive features are lost if administrative veto is exercised too frequently or too arbitrarily.

It is imperative that administrators become better informed regarding faculty needs, aspirations, and value systems and that they take this information into account in efforts to provide opportunity and incentive for improvement. Many college administrators are in tune with faculty aspirations while others retain rather distorted images of faculty life. Only a few, however, retain views like those of one administrator who suggested that a faculty member who requests a contract is not suited to small college teaching!

Faculty Attributes and the "College" Image

In the long run, basic improvement of approaches to the in-service development of faculty members requires more adequate knowledge of faculty attributes and factors which influence choice of teaching in a small college. Small-college faculty members, for example, may have characteristics and concerns different from those of faculty members in universities. There may be aspects both of institutional selection and of self-selection operative in the process of recruitment to small-college teaching which need to be taken into account in efforts to understand the needs and motivations of faculty members in such contexts.

It is worthy of note, for example, that half of the faculty members selected for interviews (and half of the total faculty) in the 20 colleges visited during the course of the study have baccalaureate origins in small colleges; and, almost two thirds of these faculty members could be classified as having similar origins if those from colleges with some small-college features despite enrollments somewhat in excess of 2000 were included (e.g., smaller private universities and state colleges). It has been noted, of course, that it is the universities which supply the majority of graduate students and, even more pronouncedly, those likely to become doctoral candidates.[1]

The trends observed in the twenty colleges visited may not be representative of the situation for small colleges generally, but it is plausible to hypothesize that the experience of attending, or those factors leading to the initial decision to attend, a small college may tend to influence the subsequent choice of a small college as a place for employment. Thus the colleges visited (and perhaps others) may be dealing with individuals who, in the main, have been pre-oriented to the small college and who have persisted in this orientation through programs of graduate education which encourage identification with research and which are conducive to development of the "Big-University syndrome" alluded to at the outset.[2] In any event further study of the origins and attributes of small-college faculty members is needed.

---

[1] See, for example, Bernard Berelson, *Graduate Education in the United States* (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960) pp. 130-133.

Toward Better Development Programs

The road ahead for many small colleges, particularly those with limited resources, is likely to be rough. A rather bleak prospect may be envisaged for many, typically small, liberal arts colleges unless they do more to provide conditions under which faculty members "can and will work to advantage"—to provide a more distinctly attractive and hospitable general setting for better teachers *and* better teaching. It has been suggested, for example,

> [that] a good deal of the college teacher problem belongs to the college. . . . A large majority of the liberal arts colleges in this country cannot provide poor library facilities, few research opportunities, heavy teaching loads, poorer students, restrictive intellectual atmosphere, low salaries—then expect to get the better Ph.D.'s in substantial numbers. . . . If such colleges cannot meet the competition, they will not and should not get the talent.[3]

While the conditions alluded to cannot be said to be characteristic of all small colleges—included among small colleges are some of the most distinguished institutions in the region and the nation—it must be recognized that faculty development is part of the larger process of *institutional development*. Without a large-scale infusion of new resources, both human and economic, and a realistic acceptance of responsibility for "change" in outlook, many colleges will be unable to make a marked improvement in their lot.

If anything is clear as a consequence of this study it is that the small colleges of the region *are not yet responding* to the challenge of faculty development with vigor and imagination. That this conclusion might well apply to a majority of all types of higher institutions in the region and the nation is clearly of little comfort.[4]

---

[2] Eckert and Stecklein, in their study of Minnesota college teachers, observed that ". . . college teachers tend to return, in their later professional service, to institutions of the same general type they attended as undergraduates; thus two thirds of those now teaching in private liberal arts colleges graduated from church or independent college programs. . . . Most of the Minnesota institutions also seemed to be recruiting teachers primarily from colleges of their own general class or quality." [See, Ruth E. Eckert and John E. Stecklein, *Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers:* Cooperative Research Monograph No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961) pp. 12-13.]

[3] Bernard Berelson, "Theses on the Preparation of College Teachers," in John W. Gustad, Editor, *Faculty Preparation and Orientation* (Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960) p. 53.

In view of the magnitude of the problems facing many small colleges and the obvious complexity of the process of faculty development, a limited concept of faculty development "procedures" will not prove viable. There can be no reliance on isolated practices and procedures, rules, directives, pronouncements, exhortations, the strategem of "letting nature take its course," or even "togetherness" to achieve unity of purpose, more effective teaching, institution-wide concern on the part of faculty members, or any of the other major goals considered in this report.

The procedures examined in this study clearly hold forth no promise of salvation. It is, however, quite possible for all colleges to strengthen "faculty development" by making more frequent and effective use of those procedures *which have relevance for them*. But, each college must determine what its specific goals for faculty development will be in terms of its own conceptualization of the problem, and its own circumstances, resources, and needs.

Despite the fact that no general solution can be written for the problems which inevitably will be encountered in any serious effort to make "faculty development" a meaningful concept on every campus, certain general courses of action might be followed with profit:

First, in order to provide for more effective administrative leadership—a necessary condition for improvement—college presidents must allocate to the dean the responsibility, time and resources required for effective leadership in faculty development. Once this is done and the dean has been freed to some extent from things of lesser importance—computing grade averages, concern for landscaping, apprehending students for disciplinary infractions—he can devote his major energies to the task of fostering on the campus an atmosphere characterized by faculty excitement over a combination of teaching, keeping intellectually alert through relevant (though not necessarily published) research, and rendering service to the college. In this capacity, the dean may come to be thought of more as a dean of the faculty than as a dean of the college, and he should be far more specialized in experience, preparation, and special research skills than the dean of the college normally is.

---

[4] Newburn following a study of faculty personnel policies in eleven state universities throughout the country, conducted under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, stated: "One of the most obvious conclusions to be reached by visitations and other observations is the almost total lack of any well-defined and clearly articulated program for faculty acquisition, promotion, retention, and separation even in the older, larger, and most distinguished publicly supported universities. There is great variation among the institutions and . . . the best practice [leaves] much to be desired." [H. K. Newburn, "Comments Relating to Faculty Retention and Conditions of Work," in John Gustad, Editor, *Faculty Utilization and Retention* (Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960) pp. 39-40].

Based on his survey for the American Council on Education of faculty evaluation practices in a large number of colleges and universities, Gustad concluded: "It was painfully obvious that *nowhere* is there a program of faculty evaluation which can be considered even approximately adequate . . ." [John W. Gustad, "An Ancient and Honorable Profession," *AAUP Bulletin*, September 1962, pp. 261-265.]

Anderson, after a survey of almost 300 institutions in the SREB states with particular reference to practices in teaching the humanities, had the following to say regarding in-service training: "But programs of this kind [designed to assist the new teacher in his adjustment to departmental and classroom circumstances] . . . are few in number in the region—almost nonexistent except for those in a few schools designed to re-tool graduate assistants . . ." [A. Edwin Anderson, *The Humanities in the Colleges and Universities of the South* (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1961)].

And, secondly, without waiting for the aforementioned state of affairs to materialize, each institution could profitably examine and assess its current efforts within the framework of such questions as the following:

> 1. Is there, on this campus, a generally understood concept of the "process" of faculty development and of the institution's responsibilities in respect to fostering conditions conducive to in-service growth and development?
>
> 2. Are major goals and objectives clearly formulated *in operational terms?*
>
> 3. Are major problems in respect to faculty development reasonably clearly defined and understood by both faculty and administration?
>
> 4. Is there a long-range *plan* for dealing with problems of faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, and in-service growth?

The need for more systematically and comprehensively designed programs for development cannot be overemphasized. Institutions which do not attempt to anticipate the future realistically and develop their plans accordingly may well suffer serious consequences, particularly if they start from a somewhat unfavorable competitive position.

Suggestions for Further Action and Research

The major emphasis in this study has been on "faculty development" with an *institutional* reference. It must be remembered that faculty improvement (growth, development) also has an *individual* reference. As Stickler has suggested, "A growing faculty does a better job for the college. At the same time, it enjoys and profits from the experience of growing. An intelligent administration will keep both objectives equally in mind."[5] Faculty members should be encouraged to project their long-range plans for improvement, with the faculty member identifying his own goals and needs and the college attempting to relate them to college projections and goals.

From a research point of view, basic studies of the process of faculty "growth" as it takes place in a group of college teachers are badly needed. Some years ago, Eckert pointed up the need for "*experimental studies of the nature and extent of teacher growth in service, tracing what actually happens to representative teachers as they progress in their college service,*" but there is as yet no evidence that such studies have been made.[6]

The problem of assessing "growth" in the performance of various roles of college teaching—e.g., a classroom role, an institutional role and a professional role—is, of course, part of the problem of evaluating performance of teachers. Both are, in turn, related to the problem of evaluating the effectiveness of any institutional effort at "faculty development" insofar as "improvement" or "change" in faculty performance are included among the stated goals of such a program. Without more adequate understanding of the "growth" process and more adequate methods and rationales for assessing "growth" the problem of basing "rewards" on meritorious service and improved effectiveness, as well as on years of service and degrees earned, will continue to be formidable.[7]

Also important are studies of faculty attitudes and values which might bear upon their satisfaction with teaching in small colleges.[8] Studies concerned with identifying factors associated with choice of the small college as a context for employment might be particularly fruitful. The probability that teachers tend to return in later employment to institutions of the same general type that they attended as undergraduates has already been mentioned. This phenomenon, and its implications, should be studied carefully. More emphasis on recruitment to college teaching careers is warranted in all small colleges,[9] and this emphasis might well be part of a more general emphasis on the recruitment to graduate study of all qualified young people. Each college should at least study systematically the plans of its students for further formal education after college graduation. And it is possible that much could be done to improve college teaching—in the long view—by giving selected undergraduates experience as tutors, laboratory assistants, or teaching assistants.

---

[5] W. Hugh Stickler, "Use of Institution-Wide Agencies in Improving Teaching Effectiveness," in Fred J. Kelley, Editor, *Improving College Instruction* (Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1951) p. 121.

[6] Ruth E. Eckert, "Conditions Favorable to Faculty Improvement," in Fred J. Kelley, *ibid.*, p. 176.

[7] The critical importance of this area has been recognized by authorities concerned with "merit-salary" plans in the public schools. One of the most thorough examinations of the problem of developing an adequate rationale for assessing teacher growth in-service, is that conducted by the Merit-Salary Committee of the New England School Development Council. [David V. Tiedeman, Editor, *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary* (Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1956), pp. 85-90.]

[8] A member of the advisory committee for this project suggested the importance of a comprehensive study that would treat the faculty as a "living, functioning group." This study, he feels, should deal with "the professor—his habitat, mating calls, Pavlovian responses, loud outcries, and protective coloration." Another called attention to the need for a study of liberal arts faculty as an "under-developed area."

For the current crop of young college teachers, the potential value of seminars or institutes on college teaching should be considered carefully. Patterned along lines which have proved useful and workable for college administrators, such institutes could be cooperatively planned and developed by several small colleges.

In considering these possibilities, small colleges cannot afford to neglect the more obvious need to foster general conditions conducive to faculty growth: better salaries, academic facilities—libraries and laboratories, working conditions, and the like. Nor can they afford to ignore the possibility that the continued growth of small colleges (in the South and in the nation) in stature and in service is contingent upon their cultivation of distinctive roles and realistically delimited programs, designed to meet clearly understood institutional objectives. There is obvious need for the small colleges of the South to determine their distinctive role in liberal education. They must determine their special purposes and their "place in the sun," in the face of trends toward "bigness" in higher education.

---

[9] This point might be applicable for *all* colleges. It has been made, for example, by Medsker with respect to *junior colleges*. Noting that 27 per cent of the staff members recently surveyed in 72 junior colleges had once attended a junior college, Medsker observed that "the long-term recruitment of junior college teachers may well begin with the present generation of junior college students." Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960) p. 173.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

APPENDIXES

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES IN SELECTED COLLEGES[1]

In this appendix are accounts of approaches to faculty development in several small colleges of the region, selected because they are representative of the more interesting and varied approaches encountered during the time this study was in progress. In each instance, the report illustrates use of procedures in a manner planned by the college to conform to the particular philosophy of the institution and to serve its particular needs.

Descriptions contained in this appendix were compiled from printed materials of the college and/or from interviews with administrators and faculty members. The institutions represented and the individual at each institution who was particularly helpful in providing the basic information for this appendix are as follows:

Austin College	Dean Leo Nussbaum
Birmingham-Southern College	Dean Cecil Abernathy
Clark College	Dean A. R. McPheeters
Goucher College	Dean Elizabeth Geen
Jacksonville University	Dean William Highsmith
Louisiana College	Dean Jay Taylor
Randolph-Macon College	Dean W. A. Mabry
Wayland Baptist College	Dean Cecil Cosper

These descriptions refer to conditions as they existed during the academic year, 1960-61.

---

[1] The descriptions in this appendix were prepared by W. Starr Miller.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT AUSTIN COLLEGE

At Austin College, Sherman, Texas, the approach to faculty development is made through an experiment in defining, organizing, and operating a Christian liberal arts college. The faculty development aspect is identifiable as a portion of this three-year effort of the faculty to establish techniques for accomplishment of the project and in the efforts of the administration to simplify the details of management so as to free faculty members for teaching, counseling, institutional study, and research.

The Austin College Plan

Under a Ford Foundation grant the college is engaging in an experiment to provide a unified approach to the operation of a college with an integrated core curriculum, an emphasis on religious maturity, student life experiences aimed at developing a purposeful climate on campus, and new approaches to finance and management. The purpose of the faculty development program is understood best in the context of this experiment known as the "Austin College Plan."

Integrated Core Studies

The integrated core curriculum is comprised of the general areas of humanities-social science, and mathematics-natural science. Several teaching methods are involved in the integrated core studies including lecture, discussion, research, team planning, and team teaching. This work is completed in the freshman and sophomore years with some independent study for the experimental group in the junior and senior years.

The Religious Maturity Program

The philosophy of the college stresses achievement of spiritual maturity as well as intellectual and physical maturity. A major departure from the traditional chapel program is the separation of the classes into groups for religious maturity lectures. Different series of lectures by the dean of the chapel are presented on the assumption that this will better permit the student to see that "his God can grow" as he grows in the college.

The Campus Life Program

This program is aimed toward the development of social competence, participation in the planning and regulation of college affairs, and better physical and intellectual development. It covers campus clubs, forums, budgets, discipline, and the creation of the spirit and tone for the campus. It aims to coordinate these elements of student life through responsible administration by students.

Special Studies in Finance and Management

The new organization of the college provides for operational decisions to be made in the light of all the issues of college operation. A central college council has replaced administrative committees freeing many faculty members for teaching and related activities. Experimentation and fiscal accounting has reduced the number of accounts by 50 per cent.

Need for Faculty Development

Efforts to establish an experimental program of this type require careful definition of aims and use of such techniques as team teaching and group planning of courses. The experiment has concentrated on helping the faculty to develop appropriate techniques and understandings and the purpose of the faculty development program has come to be that of helping faculty members develop the techniques and understandings necessary for the new type of college envisioned at Austin. The program starts in the search for persons to fill vacancies at the college. Efforts are made to attract young faculty members who wish to try new things.

New faculty members attend an orientation conference of one day covering such subjects as the history and traditions of the college, business affairs, the place of the college in the community and the special features of organization and administration of the academic program. This is followed by a conference for *all* faculty members.

The dean of the college has two conferences with each new faculty member during the first semester. In these conferences he attempts to learn of the problems that have been encountered. In offering to help with the interpretation of these problems, the dean is careful to point out that improvement in teaching, not administrative assessment, is his primary concern. He lets each new faculty member know that he and the head of the department are available to give assistance in problems involved in college teaching.

During the academic year 1960-61, the college asked each faculty member to complete a questionnaire reflecting his professional activity and his plans for the future. Through such procedures, the college learns something of the career aspirations of each faculty member and attempts, on the basis of this, to help the faculty member plan his own program for professional development. It is anticipated that this attempt to learn more about the career aspirations of faculty members eventually will lead to asking each faculty member to plan a tentative program of professional growth for ten years. This proposed program of professional growth would be examined by the institution to determine if it can constitute a joint institution-faculty commitment for the future growth of the faculty member involved. This program would become effective at the time a faculty member applies for tenure in the institution. Through this program the college will say to the faculty member, in effect, "You plan what you want in the years ahead and we will determine whether or not we can help you accomplish this." The purpose of such a plan of professional growth would be to undergird the vitality of the faculty in the long run.

Austin College makes use of the term "relevant research" and it encourages research with financial support if it is relevant to teaching responsibilities. Both professors and students may participate in approved research projects and research involving students receives highest priority. A committee has been set up to handle this particular facet of the program. The committee has the responsibility of attempting to secure sources of support for relevant research and for the encouragement of relevant research on the campus.

A Question of Results

An important question to be raised about the Austin experiment is "What influence does this experiment have on the development of the faculty?" It was the impression of the writer that *it has helped to develop the idea that it pays to improve.* The image of experimentation reflected by the college does attract faculty members. Early in the program 19 new faculty members were drawn to Austin College because many of them were impressed with the opportunities it offered for teaching in a program of this type. With the 19 new teachers, the percentage of doctorates at Austin College rose to more than 50 per cent. Faculty members feel there has been a noticeable increase in faculty interest and concern about what is taking place in other schools across the country. Faculty members pointed out that the experimentation in curriculum requires cooperation and special preparation. Some of those who had participated in this expressed the feeling that they teach in a different manner as a result of it. They felt that attitudes were different as a result of re-examination of personal philosophy and educational philosophy, that they were better informed about what is going on in higher education, and that there exists on the campus a greater appreciation for interdepartmental approaches to curricular organization. One faculty member summed it up by saying, "We are less provincial."

The desire of the administration to free and relax the faculty members, to permit them to be creative and involved is manifest in many practices that promote faculty development. All faculty members have expenses paid to a regional meeting each year and all faculty members have secretarial help or other nonprofessional assistance. Private offices are provided for all faculty members and the procedures for securing materials such as paper, small items of equipment, etc., have been simplified to permit the faculty member to draw this material from the supply room without detailed procedures for accounting.

Faculty members are given an avenue to the Board of Trustees through a project to develop the interaction of the board and faculty. This is done by setting up meetings of Board committees with faculty members. The effort here has been directed at impressing both the Board and the faculty with the concept that trustee approval is a final process rather than an administrative decision. In reality, where one special field of work is concerned, the decision is one that involves all persons, especially the faculty member concerned.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT GOUCHER COLLEGE

Plan for Orientation

In the academic year, 1955-56, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland, instituted, with the help of a generous subsidy from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, an orientation program which was designed to equip new faculty members with a knowledge and understanding of the philosophy of education that lies behind the curricular and co-curricular efforts of the college. The assumption was that by means of the program new faculty members would be able to reach in the first year of their teaching a level of understanding ordinarily requiring two or three years to achieve. It was also hoped that by means of the program the college could assure itself of faculty members who had been thoroughly grounded in the thinking and practices of the college and who could thus absorb more easily the shock of an unprecedented number of retirements for age which the college faced between 1955 and 1958.

The program which has been in progress since 1955 has gone through two phases in its development. The first phase was characterized by the designation of a few new members of the faculty as "interns." Though they were given full faculty status and attended faculty and departmental meetings, the "interns" had a slightly reduced course load to provide time for the tasks assigned them.

The next phase of the program was instituted the following year. All new members of the faculty were caught into the program. No teaching loads were lightened since it was discovered in the initial phase of the program that new members of the faculty could take on a full load without undue strain.

Under both phases of the program, seminar meetings were designed to give information about the college: its history, its philosophy of education, and the development of its curriculum. The meetings were held fortnightly for the first term and for half of the second term. By the middle of the year, in February, the seminar meetings were replaced by departmental projects which varied according to departmental need but which centered for the orientees on curriculum development with respect to their particular department. All the projects reflected the general interest of the departments in critical self-survey.

In addition to the general seminar meetings and the departmental projects, the orientees have been asked to attend meetings of committees which portray most vividly the role of the faculty in making policy and in carrying out the educational aims of the college. Thus the orientees were asked to attend at least one meeting each of the Records Committee, the Honors Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. As part of their orientation to the co-curricular program of the college, they have been invited into the residence halls so that they may see how the academic and the co-curricular efforts of the college are meshed.

Plan for Growth of Faculty in Service to Student and College

The seminar meetings have used workshop sessions to describe the total guidance program of the college. The orientees have been asked to play the role of the Admissions Committee and the Scholarship Committee, with administrative members of those committees present —the Dean, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Admissions. In this way the orientees have learned not only how objective data may be built into a meaningful whole but also how the committee system of the college actually functions.

In the evaluation of the program in the spring of 1958, it was decided to change the program somewhat by eliminating the departmental projects. It was felt that they were in a certain sense unnecessary, since inevitably new faculty members are drawn into the curricular planning of their departments. It was agreed that there should be definite assignments for the meetings so that the new faculty members might better prepare themselves for the discussion periods that follow the descriptions of particular aspects of the academic program.

As part of the orientation program each new faculty member is asked to attend one of the three regularly scheduled meetings of the Records Committee which has the task of considering the records of students who have received failing grades or whose grade point averages at the end of the year fall below certain specified averages. Its actions are governed by the consideration of what seems educationally best from the twin vantage points of the college and of the student. The record of each student is considered on its own merit and is not subject to rules of automatic disposition.

The new faculty members may choose which one of the three Records Committee meetings scheduled during th year he would wish to attend, but each should plan to attend at least one.

Faculty members make a gradual transition from these limited experiences to a full voice in the affairs of the college. Faculty at Goucher, by tradition and bylaws, have a strong voice in academic affairs, faculty personnel policies, and curriculum.

Plan for Growth of Faculty in Scholarship and Teaching Effectiveness

The responsibility for scholarship development is a personal matter encouraged by administrative action. The responsibility for assistance in teaching effectiveness is that of the departmental chairman.

Two examples of administrative procedures encouraging scholarship are the support of research and publication, and financial assistance for attendance at professional meetings.

A contract with the Johns Hopkins University Press makes it possible for the college to issue books under a joint Goucher-Hopkins imprint. Funds are appropriated to assist in the publication of significant manuscripts which present the results of research or other creative writing by a member of the faculty or by visiting scholars lecturing at the college. The Publication Committee appointed by the president acts with a Hopkins committee to receive manuscripts, arrange with the press for their evaluation, and act as the agent for the administration of the Goucher-Hopkins contract. The committee, in accordance with established criteria, determines the amount of subsidy if any to be given toward underwriting the publication of the manuscript.

Members of the faculty may make requests for grants in aid of research in varying amounts according to the magnitude of the research task they are contemplating or in which they are engaged. The amounts that may be requested range from $250 to $800.

Educational leadership within the department is the responsibility of a chairman who directs the formulation of policies which will provide guidance for the members of the department and a rationale for a sound course of study and the best educational use of laboratories. The chairman is expected to seek the advice and counsel of his colleagues within the department and work in close cooperation with them.

Specific functions that are the responsibility of chairmen in promoting the aims and goals of the college and department are outlined in a job definition. These include: recommendation of new appointments to the staff; promotion of members of the department who are eligible and qualified for advancement; and, submission to the president of a brief annual report on each member of the department who is not on tenure. The report evaluates strengths as well as weaknesses and comments on the factors that are most relevant using the criteria of judgment for promotion and tenure listed by the committee on promotion and tenure. The evaluation of the individual's teaching powers is made after the chairman has had some first hand acquaintance with his colleague's conduct of a class, such acquaintance to be secured in whatever way the chairman considers advisable. The chairman informs the individual in question of the contents of the evaluation report in a suitable way and the chairman assumes the duties of guidance for the faculty members as seems most fitting.

Orientation Seminars at Goucher

First Session: The Grading System The Dean and Registrar

The grading system and the procedures to be followed in reporting grades.

Second Session: The Philosophy of the College The President

The readings listed below round out with specific details the President's presentation of the philosophy of the college. All are on file in the Dean's office.

1. Middle States Evaluation
2. Bulletin of Goucher College
3. Report of the Curriculum Committee
4. Report of the Records Committee
5. Reports on Scholarships

Third Session: The Administrative Structure of the College
The Dean

Faculty Committees
Administrative Charts

The new faculty members are asked to study carefully the administrative charts which show the relationship of the various faculty committees to the Faculty, the Administrative Officers, and the Board of Trustees. The committee structure reveals how the faculty delegates its authority for the administration of various aspects of the educational program.

Fourth Session: The Guidance System and Its Ramifications
The Director of Admissions
Chairman, Admissions Committee

Admissions

The objective of this meeting is to familiarize the new faculty with the procedures followed by the Admissions Committee in its selection of entering students. Faculty members are asked to study carefully *College Board Scores* on file in the Dean's office.

Fifth Session:	The Guidance System and Its Ramifications The Dean of Students President, Judicial Board *The Honor System* The Dean of Students at the meeting will discuss the role of student activities, student government, the calendar, and the collaborative efforts of faculty and students in certain areas of student activities.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT WAYLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE

The Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Texas, faculty development program is referred to as the "In-Service Education Program" under the supervision of a committee on in-service education. Some practices for faculty development have existed at Wayland for a long while, but the identification of these activities as a distinct program with a specific purpose as contrasted with separate practices came in 1957 with the installation of Dr. Cecil Cosper as dean. Recognizing this area of activity as the special responsibility of the dean and aware of the special need for a college on the plains of western Texas to make faculty life stimulating and challenging, the dean led a new committee in outlining the program.

The general purpose of the program was to create an academic environment in which the faculty could better experience growth and advance the purposes of the college. To accomplish this purpose, the program was to center on three areas of activity and study: (1) *college policy*, as an approach to defining and advancing the aims of the college; (2) *general culture*, as a means of creating a community of scholars in a college somewhat removed from a cosmopolitan center; and (3) *methodology*, as a means of stimulating professional growth. Three major methods have been employed by the in-service education committee to accomplish the purposes of the program. These are self-developed activities on campus, faculty participation off campus, and professional visitors to the campus.

Self-Developed Activities on Campus

Through the in-service education committee, a number of organized and informal activities have influenced the program. The educational policies committee has become a permanent committee to work on the frontier of curriculum development and make suggestions to the academic council. These two committees have stimulated the development of the "faculty coffee break," so named because of the room and the equipment though it actually is a weekly meeting for the informal and unstructured discussion of issues of the campus. A chairman for the meeting, not an administrator, is prepared to pose a previously unannounced question when the group arrives. The "faculty coffee break" has discussed such topics as school spirit, honor programs, and spiritual life of the campus. Decisions are not made here, and no votes are taken. In these meetings and in agenda-less meetings of the in-service education committee, ideas and possible courses of action are suggested for the two academic committees.

A pre-college workshop each fall, referred to as the "faculty clinic," is a faculty-developed activity which often involves professional visitors to the campus. The workshop program for the fall of 1960 was on the subject of "The Pursuit of Excellence in Teaching-Learning."

Each faculty meeting includes a period for "professional activities." This period usually is composed of two activities: a report of some development in the curriculum of the college, and a faculty paper or panel. During a recent year, papers were presented on a variety of subjects, including: "What Does Scholarship Mean to Me as a Faculty Member," "Mexican Migrant Labor," and "The Impact of Logical Positivism on Contemporary Philosophy."

Other self-developed activities on campus include provision by the college of subscriptions to professional journals in the name of the persons requesting the journals and the payment of the membership fee for one professional organization for each faculty member. A campus press exists but is used only on occasion for the publication of faculty writing. One book on government has been published in recent months.

Private offices for all faculty members are provided at Wayland College. These are grouped by departments where possible and usually are in the same building with the classrooms used by the faculty members who occupy the offices. The administration and faculty members interviewed felt that private offices enabled faculty members to be more productive.

Procedures have been set up for promoting research and writing by faculty members. A committee has been appointed for this purpose and a faculty member may apply to the dean for a reduced teaching load for a semester in order to do a research project. If the proposal is approved, this normally would mean a decreased course load of three hours.

Faculty Participation Off Campus

As a part of the in-service education program at Wayland College, it was recognized that self-improvement demands time, energy, and resources. One of the means the college has employed to assist teachers in development of their professional competence has been financial aid for graduate study. This program exists in lieu of a sabbatical leave program. Arrangements are made on an individual basis for leave and a monthly stipend of $75 per month for approved graduate study. Within the past two years, three faculty members have benefited from this program. The program has served to improve members, to hold faculty members, and to a lesser degree, to attract faculty members to Wayland.

Another activity in the area of faculty participation off campus is the college provision to finance attendance at professional meetings. Every faculty member is encouraged to attend meetings of the professional societies in his field and some monetary assistance is provided to make this possible. This provision is usually sufficient for sending approximately one half of the faculty members to a regional meeting with total expenses paid each year.

Professional Visitors to the Campus

As an integral part of the Wayland program of in-service education has been a series of outstanding visiting speakers and consultants over the past four years. This series has included such out-of-state persons as: Dr. Doak S. Campbell, President Emeritus of Florida State University; Dr. Thomas E. Jones, President Emeritus of Earlham College; Dr. Paul Dressel, Director of Institutional Research, Michigan State University; Dr. Reuben Gustavson, former Director of Resources for the Future, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Magness R. Hestenes, Professor of Mathematics, University of California; Dr. Duke McCall, President, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky; Dr. Leo Eddleman, President, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana; Dr. Elton Trueblood, Professor of Philosophy, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana; Dr. Margaret Lorimer, Assistant Director for Research, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan; and Dr. Orin Cornette, Executive Assistant, Division of Higher Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Faculty members and administration indicate that this series of visiting lecturers on problems of higher education has been valuable in developing understanding of current developments in the field. It has also served a public relations purpose at Wayland College. As a result of having these visitors on campus, usually for more than a brief period, the academic program has been viewed by outstanding educators. Constructive suggestions have been received and the academic reputation of the institution has been developed beyond the local area. Dr. Cosper, Dean of Wayland, states that the money to finance the visits of these speakers is, "Something we plan for with the faith that it will be present when the time comes to make the payment." It has not been necessary to place a stable amount in the budget for this purpose.

Professor Nathan Grundstein of the Graduate School of Public

International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh has made a study of approaches to faculty development. He concluded that only at the University of Pittsburgh was he able to find a formal statement of a well-defined faculty development program. While the program at Wayland does not meet all the criteria of Professor Grundstein's definition, it is one of the more formal programs especially designed for faculty development encountered during the course of this survey.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE

The faculty development plan at Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia, is based on three major objectives for which key words are (1) assimilation, (2) stimulation, and (3) recognition. Procedures for faculty development are planned with these objectives in mind.

Procedures Designed to Build a Better Qualified Faculty

An orientation session is conducted for new faculty each year in order to clarify the aim and purpose of the college. Printed materials as well as persons are useful in this process. An article by the dean of the college tracing the origin and development of the Randolph-Macon concept of liberal arts gives a clearer understanding of how the college strives to help students come to know something of the "good life" and, at the same time, achieve positions of prominence in business and the professions. First-year faculty members usually are given a decreased teaching load to allow time for the development of courses and the free flow of initiative as they are assimilated into the life of the college.

A practice designed to increase the academic qualifications of faculty members has resulted in a high percentage of doctorates, especially in some critical fields. Under this procedure the college seeks to employ relatively young men of promise. After three years of mutual inspection and subsequent interest and satisfaction, the college will assist them in the completion of the doctorate. Such a faculty member is under obligation to return to the college for a specified period of time. This procedure has been effective in encouraging faculty members to remain with the college and, along with other procedures for faculty development, it is believed to be a major factor underlying the relatively high average faculty tenure which is characteristic of the college.

Procedures Designed to Stimulate Scholarship

Encouragement is given faculty members to pursue a special interest. This encouragement is both formal and informal. The formal often is an outgrowth of the informal efforts on the part of the administration to discover some of the personal aspirations of faculty for their own growth. With a knowledge of these desires, the president and dean seek to help the faculty member secure what is needed for the project. This may range from a college grant of $100 for research to a Fulbright grant or sabbatical leave. A sabbatical leave is granted to a limited number of faculty on the basis of a plan of improvement submitted by the faculty member. At the end of the improvement period the faculty member makes a report to the faculty. Encouragement and assistance for faculty to secure grants from outside sources during the past five years has resulted in one Fulbright award, grants from Ford, Danforth, and DuPont, and other grants (for publishing or for small research projects). All faculty interviewed at the college had some investigation, writing, or project either underway or just completed. One man with 36 years tenure had been on sabbatical leave during the previous semester to do research in a medical school and after returning to the college was continuing a portion of his project.

The college has a plan for underwriting the cost of publication. Within recent years this plan has provided assistance to two professors in the publication of books and to others in the expenses connected with the preparation of journal articles. The John P. Branch Historical Papers provide the faculty in the social sciences with opportunity for the publication of their writing.

Certain distinctive features of the program of instruction at Randolph-Macon were found to be a source of intellectual stimulation for faculty. The senior research thesis, for example, is a distinctive program at Randolph-Macon which is one of the few colleges requiring such a research project for the completion of the bachelor's degree. Under this plan each senior must undertake a project in his major field of study and present a formal written report of the investigation and its outcome.

Each year around 40 per cent of these seniors continue work in graduate schools. Faculty members indicate that this not only is a stimulating experience for students but it provides faculty members with an opportunity and outlet for some of their research interests. In the instructional program some efforts have been made to utilize team teaching in seminars across departmental lines. This practice carries into the area of submitting papers to the persons in other fields for their criticism and suggestions.

Recognition of the Faculty

A part of the Randolph-Macon tradition of personnel relations is the concept that a properly motivated faculty will be a productive faculty, and, as this happens, recognition should accompany it. Recognition, even though of a small and personal nature can be very meaningful to the individual. A college faculty is "recognized" when it is given certain freedoms and when it is given responsibility and credit for the development of academic matters, departments or curriculum, as well as when it is given promotions and salary increments. Student groups may also give recognition to faculty. While on campus the writer happened to secure a copy of the special science edition of the campus paper. Easily a third of the paper was devoted to the accomplishment and personalities of the faculty in the science and mathematics division.

Other types of faculty development activities at Randolph-Macon include the faculty club dinner meeting twice each year when some faculty member presents a paper and a faculty wives club that meets once each month with speakers, teas, and social affairs. Through the University Center in Virginia, the college benefits from the cooperative financing of faculty research and the visiting scholars program of this organization. Visiting scholars have included national figures in history, biology, literature, theology, and philosophy. Programs of this type facilitate faculty contact with noted figures in their own fields.

Success in faculty recognition at Randolph-Macon stems from efforts to keep administratively supported development in close tune with the hopes and concerns of faculty members.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN COLLEGE

Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama, represents a college that approaches faculty development through a limited number of well-planned procedures. It is evident that careful thought has been given to some conditions that stabilize personnel and promote their growth. The faculty handbook contains a statement on faculty development in a section devoted to academic freedom, tenure, basis for raises and promotions, information on sabbatical leaves, information on funds to attend professional meetings, information on retirement, information on loans for faculty members, and information on the rather unique faculty housing program of Birmingham-Southern. Other faculty development practices present on campus are not described in this published statement, however.

Faculty development procedures at Birmingham-Southern are of two types: (1) those designed to promote faculty security and (2) those designed to provide encouragement and inspiration for creativity.

Promoting Security

There are statements and conditions that give faculty members assurance of freedom and understanding of conditions affecting attainment of tenure. There is a clear indication that raises and promotions will be based on such matters as participation in community life, research and creative contributions, training and experience, and effectiveness in the classroom. There is a statement that "effectiveness" will be judged by heads of departments, the administration, and the academic policy committee. However, no specific plans are set up for determining effectiveness other than those stated in this rather general manner.

Sabbatical Leave

Birmingham-Southern has a well established and functioning program for sabbatical leaves. The published information on sabbatical leaves indicates that these are granted as an aid and inspiration to further achievement. It is clearly pointed out that these do not serve as a reward for past service. All faculty members and administrative officers are eligible for the sabbatical leave of a full year at half pay or two quarters at two-thirds pay. This practice was the one receiving the highest rating when faculty members were interviewed.

Attendance at Professional Meetings

The college encourages attendance at professional meetings and, generally, pays one half the expenses for a faculty member unless the faculty member is presenting a paper or holding an office. In this event, the college pays the entire cost of attendance at the meeting.

Retirement Plan

Birmingham-Southern has a very liberal retirement program. It is a program of TIAA, optional for pre-tenure faculty. The faculty member may deposit up to 7½ per cent of his earnings matched by the college. For the first five years of tenure, the faculty member deposits 5 per cent and the college pays 10 per cent of the retirement. After five years of tenure, the college pays the entire 15 per cent.

Faculty Loan Fund

The college maintains a small loan fund available to staff members to cover emergencies that may arise from time to time. Loans are normally expected to be repaid before the end of the academic year; however, it is possible to renew the loan at the end of the academic year. This loan carries interest of only 4½ per cent.

Faculty Housing Plan

One of the most unique arrangements for the security of faculty members at Birmingham-Southern is the faculty housing plan. A very desirable section of the campus has been designated for faculty housing and pavement, sewage, and utilities have been installed. After a staff member establishes tenure, he may lease a lot in this section for 50 years at one dollar per year. He may construct a home on this lot to be his so long as he remains at Birmingham-Southern College. The investment committee of the endowment fund will lend the staff member up to 90 per cent of the cost of construction of his house at four per cent interest payable over a period not to exceed 25 years. Since the property remains in the name of the college, there is no assessment of taxes against the homeowner. Should the person leave the employment of the college, the house may be sold to another staff member; or the college will arrange to buy it at fair market value determined by an appraising committee. This is a special inducement to faculty members to remain on the faculty of Birmingham-Southern since it provides them with a home in a most desirable section of the community.

Encouragement

Research and Creative Activities

The college has established a fund to be used to encourage research and creative activities within the faculty. Project proposals are submitted to the academic policy committee for approval. The primary purpose of this fund is to encourage original research or creative work, and it is not used to support further graduate study. Starting with a grant from the Carnegie Foundation for the improvement of instruction a number of years ago and continued by a grant from the General Education Board, it is now administered with money from the annual budget. The projects approved under these grants usually are conducted in the summer quarter.

Committee on Instruction

The college has a committee on instruction that gives its chief attention to implementing a visiting professors plan under which three John A. Whitney professors have come, with half salary paid by the college and half paid by the John A. Whitney Foundation. This plan has provided faculty members with an opportunity to have associations and exchange of ideas that they would not have had otherwise. One year this committee sponsored the attendance of a group of faculty members at the training sessions for Great Books discussion leaders. The group consisted of those who were interested in knowing more about how to lead discussions. Following this training program, they established a one-year Great Books program on the Birmingham-Southern campus; and the following year, the group led a discussion on books of their own selection.

The committee will be reorganized in the near future, possibly with the formation of two committees—one of these according to tentative plans will be called the Faculty Development Committee. This committee will consider recommendations for positions, will be charged with the orientation of new faculty members, and will act with the dean in such matters as promotions, tenure granting, and salary increases.

Faculty Publication Plan

The college publishes four editions of the *Bulletin* of Birmingham-Southern College each year. One edition is a research bulletin to present a paper by some faculty member. All faculty members are free to submit manuscripts. Usually when a faculty member submits a paper, it is placed on the preferred list for publication when his turn comes. This bulletin is distributed to those persons suggested by the professor as well as other friends of the college, and it is mailed at college expense.

In addition to these carefully planned procedures for faculty development there are certain other favorable conditions that exist as a result of a determined effort on the part of the administration. There appears to have been a determined effort to promote a feeling of freedom—freedom to teach, freedom to work without feeling unduly supervised, freedom of expression, freedom to act as a responsible member of the community as well as a faculty member.

Birmingham-Southern at one time was largely a commuter institution. Now a great majority of the students live on the campus and the emphasis today is on a strong undergraduate program leading to the professions and to accomplishments in the liberal arts. No serious departure from this type of emphasis is expected. The college is considering a restatement and clarification of its objectives but there appears to be no anxiety about what the aim of the college will be in the future. There is a feeling that the college will grow in strength, though certainly not to any great degree in enrollment or in major offerings.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY

A Statement of Conditions of Faculty Service

In the faculty handbook of Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida, there is presented a rather complete statement regarding conditions of faculty service. This plan was developed by a faculty committee, examined in the faculty, and accepted by the faculty and administration. The plan grew out of the suggestion to the faculty by the president that they should develop a plan that would enable them and the administration to have a better knowledge of the value of the service of individual faculty members to the institution and a better knowledge on the part of the faculty of opportunities for professional advancement within the institution. The material covered in the statements in the faculty handbook deals with appointment to the faculty, reappointment, changes of salary, promotions, and tenure. In this section, one finds listed the range of salary for each rank, a statement of academic freedom, procedures for removal of faculty members, and promotions and appointments policies.

Promotions and Appointments Policy

This policy grew out of the faculty belief that teaching effectiveness is related to the reward and promotion system. It was the desire of the faculty to develop a promotional system whereby special efforts in teaching and service to the institution could be recognized. This policy was developed in keeping with the emphasis at the university on the need for teaching effectiveness and it receives greater recognition under this policy than do other related activities.

Those who helped plan the program readily indicated that there was great difficulty on the part of the committee in trying to determine how teaching effectiveness could be recognized; therefore, they determined that they would approach this in three ways. These are: (1) student evaluation, (2) divisional-head evaluation, and (3) conference with the dean. In addition to teaching effectiveness, determined in this manner, other bases for promotion and increases in salary were to be degrees earned and amount of teaching experience. The statement in the handbook points up the degree and experience requirements for the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. *Failure to be promoted in rank, once the requirements are met, must be justified by the administration.* This program thus places the responsibility for withholding promotions on the administration. Salary increases are determined on the basis of rank and on the basis of evaluation.

In summary the policy for promotions and appointments specifies that advancement from one academic rank to the next is dependent in part upon college degrees earned and years of full-time college teaching experience. In addition, the evaluation of students, the divisional chairman, and the dean enter into advancement made by virtue of special merit.

STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT CLARK COLLEGE

Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia, is operated in the tradition of a Christian college, and under the auspices of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church. Its administration is dedicated to the cause of Christian education, that is, sound liberal arts learning, founded upon Christian principles. It is within this frame of reference that the instructional personnel is led to sense its responsibility and to share in the operation of the college.

Freedom of Worship

Although Clark College is operated under the auspices of The Methodist Church, denominationalism is not imposed upon faculty or students. Faculty members represent many denominations, and are free to worship as they desire.

Freedom to Teach

A teacher at Clark College carries responsibilities in several areas of the program. Nevertheless, his major assignment is teaching. In this connection, he is provided with much autonomy in conducting his classes and giving instruction on problems and issues of a controversial nature. The general principle desired, however, is that of balanced and fair inquiry rather than mere indoctrination, or narrow scientism which ignores other areas of knowledge.

Freedom to Act

Since students learn from example as well as precept it becomes necessary for a teacher at the college to conceive of his actions in and outside of the institution as being exemplary of the best in terms of the ideals of the college as a church related institution, the local community, and the nation. Though entitled to freedom of action outside collegiate bounds, the college teacher should set an example for students in community activity, consonant with the ideals of the institution.

Freedom to Grow Professionally

At Clark College, it is thought that the continuous growth of the faculty is essential for the life and progress of the institution. Therefore, opportunities for faculty growth are not restrained but encouraged by administrators and senior faculty members. This principle is made functional by the granting of study leaves, with and without financial assistance, attendance at professional meetings, other in-service activities, and reduced load for special research projects.

Freedom to Change One's Job

A faculty member at Clark has the freedom to better his condition in a professional and ethical manner. It is only natural for one to want to improve his status, and for other institutions to seek to secure the services of our top and most promising members of the faculty. We strive, however, at Clark, to make our total situation such that most of these persons are inclined to remain with us.

In those cases where members terminate their services, there exists an atmosphere of freedom and professional understanding to an extent that makes for a continuing interest in the individual by the institution, and by the individual in the college. The college assumes the responsibility of assisting the individual teacher in achieving his desired goal, and in turn the teacher should feel constrained to carry out his obligation to the college.

STATEMENT OF CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO SALARY AND RANK AT LOUISIANA COLLEGE, PINEVILLE, LOUISIANA

Guiding Principles

1. A salary schedule is desirable in that it eliminates most of the objections implicit in the individual bargaining method.
2. As far as possible, teachers' salaries should compare favorably with salaries of employed persons of equivalent preparation in other occupations.
3. Until the time comes when we have an adequate system of measuring teaching efficiency, preparation and experience appear to be the most reliable indices of merit.
4. Salaries set up in the adopted schedule are for nine months' work. Compensation for the summer session is on the basis of enrollment.
5. There is no difference in salary between men and women where they have the same training and experience.
6. In evaluating training, allowance is made for equivalent work in business areas, in artistic lines, and outstanding administrative or executive experience.
7. The minimum salary (beginner) attempts to support the teacher and give him a reasonable return on his investment in preparation.

Requirements for Various Ranks

I. Training Requirements

Instructor: Master's degree or a definite program of study leading to the master's degree.

Assistant Professor: Master's degree or equivalent.

Associate Professor: Master's degree and one further year of graduate study or equivalent.

Professor: An earned doctorate or the equivalent with full recognition of the principles that in certain fields artistic talent, successful business experience, etc., should be balanced against higher degree.

II. Experience Requirements

Assistant Professor: Three years' teaching experience or its equivalent.

Associate Professor: Six years' teaching experience or its equivalent.

Professor: Ten years' teaching experience or its equivalent.

Note: Each year of graduate or professional study after the first year beyond the B.A. is reckoned as equivalent of a year of teaching experience.

APPENDIX B

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT

Exhibit B-1

Selected Institutional Characteristics, By Size of Faculty

Variable*	Faculty size categories				
	Less than 31 (Mean)	31-60 (Mean)	61-90 (Mean)	91 plus (Mean)	Total (Mean)
(a) Size of faculty	25.8	45.0	73.3	123.4	59.2
(b) Per cent with doctorate	32.8	29.1	32.2	28.8	30.2
(c) Salary paid full-professors —in hundreds of dollars	61.0	63.9	70.5	73.3	66.5
(d) Number of new faculty members	5.1	6.9	10.7	17.5	8.9
(e) Number of faculty members leaving college, 1959-60	3.5	4.7	7.5	10.8	6.0
as a per cent of (a)	(13.6)	(10.4)	(10.2)	(8.8)	(10.1)
(f) Number going to other colleges	1.8	2.1	3.2	3.6	2.5
as a per cent of (e)	(51.4)	(44.7)	(42.7)	(33.3)	(41.7)
(g) Number of these considered to be definite professional advancement**	1.1	1.3	1.9	3.0	1.6
as a per cent of (f)	(61.1)	(61.9)	(59.4)	(83.3)	(64.0)
Number of colleges	(19)	(109)	(56)	(22)	(20)

*Except as otherwise indicated, data are for the academic year, 1960-61.

**Based on judgments provided by questionnaire respondents.

Exhibit B-2

Mean Nine-Month Salary of Professors, by Type and Location of Institution*

Type of Institution	Mean salary (dollars)	
	Southern Region	Nation
Public Universities (1959-60)	$8590	$ 9830
Private Universities (1959-60)	$9060	$10650
Small Colleges in this Study (1960-61)	$6650	xxxx
Public Liberal Arts Colleges (1959-60)	$7290	$ 9350
Private Liberal Arts Colleges (1959-60)	$6490	$ 7470

*Figures for all except the small colleges included in this study are taken from *Higher Education Planning and Management Data,* 1959-60 (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Office of Education). Differences in academic years for which data are given should be noted. The relative position of the small colleges in this study may be somewhat lower than suggested by the data.

Exhibit B-3

Mean Salary Paid Full Professors in Relation to Percentage of Faculty with the Doctorate (1960-61)

Mean salary paid full-professors 1960-61	Per cent of faculty members with doctorate*							
	Less than 30		30-39		40 plus		Total	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
$8000 or more	—	—	—	—	7	(100.0)	7	(100.0)
7000-7999	13	(48.1)	10	(37.0)	4	(14.9)	27	(100.0)
6000-6999	19	(70.4)	6	(22.2)	2	(7.4)	27	(100.0)
Less than $6000	14	(87.5)	2	(12.5)	—	—	16	(100.0)
Total	46	(59.7)	18	(23.4)	13	(16.9)	77	(100.0)

*This table is based on data for the first 77 institutions responding to the questionnaire survey.

Exhibit B-4

Reported Emphasis on Recruitment or Orientation, By Faculty Size

Size of Faculty	No. of colleges	More emphasis on recruitment	About equal emphasis on both	More emphasis on orientation
Less than 31	(19)	57.9	26.3	15.8
31-60	(111)	33.3	49.5	17.1
61-90	(56)	48.2	41.0	10.7
91 plus	(22)	27.3	50.0	22.7
Total	(208)	38.9	45.2	15.9

Exhibit B-5

Selected Institutional Characteristics, By Reported Institutional Emphasis—Recruitment *versus* Orientation of Faculty

Characteristics	More emphasis on recruitment	About equal emphasis on both	More emphasis on orientation	All colleges
	(Mean)	(Mean)	(Mean)	(Mean)
Faculty size	58.9	60.1	57.8	59.2
Percentage of faculty members with doctorate	31.8	29.5	28.0	30.3
Salary paid full professors, 1960-61 in hundreds of dollars	68.4	65.1	64.6	66.5
Number of new faculty members, 1960-61	9.6	8.4	9.4	8.9
Number leaving college faculty, 1959-60	6.6	5.7	5.5	6.0
Number of faculty members leaving for other college positions	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.6
Number leaving for college positions representing definite professional advancement (in the opinion of questionnaire respondent)	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.7
Number of colleges providing information	81	95	33	209

Exhibit B-6

Degree of Formality Characteristic of Approaches to Induction of Faculty, by Faculty Size

Size of faculty	Informal		Mostly informal		Mostly formal		Formal		Total	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Less than 31	10	52.6	9	47.4	—	—	—	—	19	100.0
31-60	23	20.9	72	65.5	14	12.7	1	0.9	110	100.0
61-90	12	21.4	38	67.9	6	10.7	—	—	56	100.0
91 and over	3	14.3	15	71.4	3	14.3	—	—	21	100.0
Total	48	23.3	134	65.0	23	11.2	1	0.5	206	100.0

Exhibit B-7

Degree of Formality Characteristic of Approaches to Faculty Development After Induction, by Faculty Size

Size of faculty	Informal		Mostly informal		Mostly formal		Formal		Total	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Less than 31	9	47.4	9	47.4	1	5.3	—	—	19	100.1
31-60	21	19.3	76	69.7	9	8.3	3	2.8	110	100.1
61-90	12	21.4	37	66.1	7	12.5	—	—	56	100.0
91 and over	3	14.3	16	76.2	2	9.5	—	—	21	100.0
Total	45	22.0	138	67.3	19	9.3	3	1.4	206	100.0

Exhibit B-8

Persons, in Addition to the Dean, Designated as Having Responsibility for Faculty Development, by Institutional Emphasis

Persons designated	More emphasis on recruitment		About equal emphasis on both		More emphasis on orientation		All colleges	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
President and department or division heads	23	28.4	19	20.0	7	21.2	49	23.4
President	20	24.7	18	18.9	5	15.2	43	20.6
Department heads,	10	12.3	18	18.9	11	33.3	39	18.7
president and other	2	2.4	11	11.9	2	6.1	15	7.2
Other*	11	13.6	12	12.6	3	9.1	26	12.4
No other person listed	15	18.5	17	17.9	5	15.2	37	17.7

*Includes vice president and department heads; registrars; registrars and department heads; etc., with no single pattern accounting for as much as 5 per cent of the total for any institutional category.

Exhibit B-9

Faculty Development Practices: Extent of Use and Administrators' Ratings of Value, for All Colleges

Practices	Colleges using practice		Rating of "limited value"		Rating of "valuable"		Rating of "most valuable"	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Planned orientation	140	67.0	7	5.0	91	65.0	42	30.0
Pre-college workshop	132	63.2	4	3.0	71	53.8	57	43.2
Handbook	137	65.6	12	8.8	76	55.5	49	35.8
Scheduled conferences	157	75.1	19	12.1	85	54.1	53	33.8
Less than normal lead for the first year	43	20.6	11	25.6	26	60.5	6	14.0
Assign to experienced teacher	68	32.5	7	10.3	42	61.8	19	27.9
Library material on higher education	134	64.1	43	32.1	80	59.7	11	8.2
Organized faculty discussions	90	43.1	16	17.8	53	58.9	21	23.3
Organized, periodic self-study	142	67.9	10	7.0	60	42.3	72	50.7
Systematic visitation of classes	31	14.8	8	25.8	19	61.3	4	12.9
Instructional improvement committee	83	39.7	14	16.9	43	51.8	26	31.3
Load adjustment for research	90	43.1	19	21.1	52	57.8	19	21.1
Load adjustment for committee work	64	30.6	13	20.3	47	73.4	4	6.2
Load adjustment for off-campus consulting or lecturing	37	17.7	9	24.3	23	62.2	5	13.5
Private offices	125	59.8	10	8.0	70	56.0	45	36.0
Salary schedule	109	52.2	15	13.8	62	56.9	32	29.4
Funds for professional meetings	162	77.5	11	6.8	101	62.3	50	30.9
Funds for graduate study	134	64.1	10	7.4	53	39.6	71	53.0
Funds for publications of research	33	15.8	12	36.4	18	54.5	3	9.1
Sabbatical at half salary or more	67	32.1	7	10.4	22	32.8	38	56.7
Visiting lecturers	73	34.9	16	21.9	40	54.8	17	23.3
Teacher exchange	8	3.8	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0

Exhibit B-10

Incidence of Faculty Development Practices, by Size of Faculty

Practice	Faculty size category			
	Less than 31 (N=19)	31-60 (N=109)	61-90 (N=56)	91 plus (N=22)
Planned orientation for new faculty	37**	68	72	77
Pre-college workshop	58	68	61	50
Faculty handbook	42	68	70	54
Departmental conferences on teaching	53	78	75	77
Reduced load for new faculty	21	22	14	23
Experienced teacher works with new teacher	32	34	26	36
Library materials in higher education	58	67	65	54
Organized discussions of college teaching	47	50	30	41
Periodic self-study of college	53	71	67	68
Systematic class-room visitation	21	18	5	18
Faculty committee on instruction	26	41	35	54
Load adjustment for research and writing	26	40	42	73
Load adjustment for committee work	26	35	21	36
Load adjustment for consultation	21	16	19	18
Private offices for all	53	67	56	46
Distribute salary schedules	37	51	58	50
Finance attendance at professional meetings	63	80	75	82
Financial assistance for graduate study	79	62	63	59
Funds for publication	10	15	18	18
Sabbatical year leave	21	29	39	41
Visiting lecturers on higher education	42	38	28	32
A functioning teacher exchange	—	4	7	—

**All entries rounded to the nearest whole per cent—e.g., some 37 per cent of the 19 institutions with less than 31 faculty members reported "planned orientation for new faculty members."

Exhibit B-11

Use of Faculty Development Practices in Relation to "Reputational Strength" of Colleges

Practice	Standing of college on the Index of Reputational Strength			
	High (N=38)	Fairly high (N=37)	Fairly low (N=37)	Low (N=37)
Planned Orientation for new faculty	71**	68	65	60
Pre-college workshop	47	60	70	73
Faculty handbook	66	65	68	62
Departmental conferences on teaching	55	73	84	81
Reduced load for new faculty	26	27	19	8
Experienced teacher works with new teacher	21	40	24	24
Library materials in higher education	47	68	65	57
Organized discussions of college teaching	34	43	35	40
Periodic self-study of college	55	73	73	62
Systematic class-room visitation	16	5	11	14
Faculty committee on instruction	42	49	30	35
Load adjustment for research and writing	55	51	38	22
Load adjustment for committee work	29	24	38	27
Load adjustment for consultation	16	22	11	22
Private offices for all	63	51	57	57
Distribute salary schedules	42	73	43	46
Finance attendance at professional meetings	84	81	78	73
Financial assistance for graduate study	66	57	76	54
Funds for publication	26	14	19	3
Sabbatical year leave	45	38	27	16
Visiting lecturers on higher education	37	35	30	35
A functioning teacher exchange	3	5	3	—

**Per cent of colleges in category using practice, rounded to the nearest whole per cent.

Exhibit B-12

Incidence of Designated Types of Provisions for Faculty Development, by "Reputational Strength" of Colleges

Nature or purpose of provision*	Standing on Index of Reputational Strength (per cent reporting provisions)			
	Top fourth N=38	Second fourth N=37	Third fourth N=37	Bottom fourth N=37
Giving new faculty members information about the total institution, its aims, policies and regulations	95	89	89	86
Helping the new faculty member to become sympathetic with and concerned about the aims and purposes of the college	68	75	76	76
Assuring faculty members of freedom of thought, action, and expression	87	65	57	78
Stimulating the flow of creative ideas and suggestions for improvement of the college	68	65	57	60
Giving first-year faculty members continuing personal assistance with teaching problems	55	54	49	70
Having periodic faculty self-evaluation of the program for faculty development	34	43	32	32
Giving new faculty members information about the characteristics of fellow faculty members and the student body	50	40	30	35
Making available non-professional aides and assistants for routines related to teaching	58	62	60	62
Having social activities for introducing new members	95	89	73	76
Giving the new faculty member information about the community	55	57	38	57
Giving orientation to wives of new faculty members	37	40	40	11

*Provisions listed in order of ratings of importance by administrators in the total sample. Entries are rounded to the nearest whole per cent.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION REGARDING THE SAMPLE AND STUDY PROCEDURES

Exhibit C-1

Faculty Development Questionnaire Response by State and Control of Institution

State	Number of Questionnaires Mailed				Number Returned			
		Independent				Independent		
	Total	Public	Private	Church	Total	Public	Private	Church
Alabama	14	3	2	9	12	2	2	8
Arkansas	13	6	1	6	12	6	1	5
Delaware	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
D. C.	3	1	0	2	3	1	0	2
Florida	7	1	4	2	6	0	4	2
Georgia	21	7	5	9	18	6	4	8
Kentucky	16	3	3	10	15	3	3	9
Louisiana	5	1	1	3	5	1	1	3
Maryland	13	2	3	8	12	2	3	7
Mississippi	10	4	0	6	9	3	0	6
North Carolina	25	4	0	21	24	3	0	21
Oklahoma	10	7	0	3	10	7	0	3
South Carolina	14	2	5	7	12	2	5	5
Tennessee	22	1	5	16	22	1	5	16
Texas	28	5	1	22	27	4	1	22
Virginia	16	2	5	9	16	2	5	9
West Virginia	10	6	1	3	10	6	1	3
TOTAL	228	56	36	136	214	50	35	129

Exhibit C-2

Basic Questionnaire

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta 13, Georgia

This questionnaire centers on but one portion of a project that will include detailed studies of faculty development in a limited number of colleges. Your reply to this inquiry will be very helpful in providing a general picture of activities in the region. You may be assured that institutional identity will not be revealed in any reports until you have been contacted for approval.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about some of the practices, conditions, and provisions in your institution that may:

help the new faculty member "fit in";
help the faculty member grow in teaching efficiency;
help the faculty member become motivated for personal and professional growth;
help the faculty member maintain morale;
help the faculty member advance the purposes of the institution.

I. *Background Data:*

1. Name of college..........
2. Name of person responding..........
3. Title of person responding..........
4. What other persons in your institution have responsibility for the development of the faculty? List positions..........
....
5. Total number on faculty.......... Full Time.......... Part Time..........
6. Total number of doctorates on faculty..........
7. What is the average salary in 1960-61 for a full professor for nine months of full-time work?..........
8. Total number of new faculty members this year..........
9. Total number of faculty who left your institution last year
....
10. Number of these who went to other college positions..........
11. How many of these (Number 10) do you consider to be professional advancements?..........

Please send copies of your catalogue, faculty handbook, manuals, statutes, any printed material used for recruitment of faculty, and copies of programs of pre-college workshops or seminars.

Basic questionnaire (Continued)

II. *Instructions:* If your institution utilizes any of the following practices or instruments for the induction and/or continued development of faculty, please check those and rate them for their value in your institution.

Practice or Instrument	Used in This College	As Used in This College This Has Proved to be of Value to Faculty Members Checked Below:		
		Of Limited Value	Valuable	Among the Most Valuable
1. Planned orientation sessions for all new faculty				
2. Pre-college workshop for all faculty				
3. Faculty handbook				
4. Scheduled conferences in some departments to deal specifically with the improvement of teaching				
5. Less than normal load for first year faculty				
6. Assignment of an experienced teacher to work with a first year teacher in developing instructional techniques				
7. Collection of library materials on higher education for faculty use				
8. Organized series of faculty discussions of college teaching				
9. Organized, systematic, and periodic faculty self-study of the college				
10. Systematic visitation of classes by administrative officers or other faculty members				
11. Active faculty committee charged with improving instruction				

Basic questionnaire (Continued)

Practice or Instrument	Used in This College	As Used in This College This Has Proved to Be of Value to Faculty Members Checked Below:		
		Of Limited Value	Valuable	Among the Most Valuable
12. Adjustment in teaching loads of individuals periodically to allow time for research and writing				
13. Adjustment in teaching load of individuals to allow time for faculty committee work				
14. Adjustment in loads of individuals to allow off-campus consulting or lecturing				
15. Private offices for all faculty				
16. Distribution of a salary schedule that clearly shows opportunities for financial advancement				
17. Annual financial assistance for at least half of the faculty to attend professional meetings				
18. Financial assistance to faculty for further graduate study				
19. Funds for publication of faculty writing				
20. Sabbatical year leaves with at least half salary				
21. Series of visiting lecturers to discuss problems of higher education				
22. A functioning teacher exchange				

Basic questionnaire (Continued)

III. *Instructions:* There are a number of things that college people have included in programs of faculty development. A few of them are listed below. We would like your opinion of the value of each of these provisions, whether or not your college is doing anything about them now. In the last column, please check if your institution does something specific to implement the provision.

Provisions for Consideration	As a Provision for Faculty Development in This College It Would Be:			We Implement This Provision
	Not Very Important	Fairly Important	Among the Most Important	
1. Provisions for giving the new faculty member information about the total institution, its aims, policies and regulations	------------	------------	------------	------------
2. Provisions for helping the new faculty member to become sympathetic with and concerned about the aims and purposes of this college	------------	------------	------------	------------
3. Provisions for giving the new member information about the characteristics of fellow faculty members and the student body	------------	------------	------------	------------
4. Provisions for giving orientation to wives of new faculty	------------	------------	------------	------------
5. Provisions for giving the new faculty member information about the community	------------	------------	------------	------------
6. Provisions for social activities especially for introducing new faculty members	------------	------------	------------	------------
7. Provisions for giving first year faculty members continuing personal assistance in teaching problems	------------	------------	------------	------------

Basic questionnaire (Continued)

Provisions for Consideration	As a Provision for Faculty Development in This College It Would Be:			We Implement This Provision
	Not Very Important	Fairly Important	Among the Most Important	
8. Provisions for giving faculty members nonprofessional aides and assistants for the routines related to teaching				
9. Provisions for stimulating the flow of creative ideas and suggestions for improvement of the college				
10. Provisions to assure faculty members of freedom of action, thought, and expression				
11. Provisions for perodic faculty evaluation of the program for faculty development				

IV. Please react to the questions below in the light of the implied definition of "faculty development" on the first page of this questionnaire:

1. Would you say that you and other members of the faculty and staff of your college place more emphasis on searching for and recruiting new faculty members or more emphasis on orienting them to their jobs and the institution after they arrive?
   A great deal more emphasis on recruitment ....
   Slightly more emphasis on recruitment ....
   About equal emphasis on each ....
   Slightly more emphasis on orientation ....
   A great deal more emphasis on orientation ....
2. In what ways do you think your institution is especially successful in orienting and providing for the continued development of its faculty?

Basic questionnaire (Concluded)

3. What are the most difficult *problems* of induction and continued faculty development in your institution?

....

....

....

....

4. In this institution the procedures for induction can be characterized as: Informal ......; Mostly informal ......; Mostly formal ......; Formal ......

5. In this institution the procedures for faculty development beyond induction can be characterized as: Informal ......; Mostly informal ......; Mostly formal ......; Formal ......

Exhibit C-3

List of Colleges Visited

Austin College, Sherman, Texas
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama
Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina
Delta State College, Cleveland, Mississippi
Goucher College, Towson, Baltimore, Maryland
Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida
Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana
Maryville College, Maryville, Tennessee
Oglethorpe University, Atlanta, Georgia
Queens College, Charlotte, North Carolina
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia
Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond Louisiana
Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma
Southern State College, Magnolia, Arkansas
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Virginia
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee
Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia
Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Texas
West Georgia College, Carrollton, Georgia
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina

Exhibit C-4

Selected Characteristics of the Interviewee Sample

Field or Position of Interviewees	Tenure With College					
	New, 1959-60	1-3 yrs.	4-10 yrs.	11 yrs. plus	Not known	Total
Faculty Members:	(30)#	(18)	(36)	(21)	(6)	(111)
Social Sciences*	12	7	15	7		41
Natural Sciences**	9	3	11	9	1	33
Humanities***	9	8	10	5	1	33
Field Not Ascertained					4	4
Administrators:						(36)
President						16
Dean						20
All Interviewees						147

*Includes history, sociology, political science, business, education, psychology.
**Includes chemistry, biology, mathematics, physics, and home economics.
***Includes philosophy, religion, languages, music, speech, and art.
#Includes ten faculty members who had no previous teaching experience.

Exhibit C-5

Questions Considered in Interviews with Administrators and Faculty Members

What are the aims of this college? (admin. & fac.)

How are faculty members made aware of these aims? (admin. & fac.)

What is the administrative belief about how faculty members "become better faculty members?" (admin. & fac.)

What are the features of this college that you project to prospective faculty as especially attractive? (admin.)

What features of this college caused you to accept a position here? (fac.)

What features of this college cause faculty to remain here? (admin.)

What is the current image of the college in the faculty view? (fac.)

Which of the specific practices or provisions for development now provided by this college are of greatest benefit to you? (fac.)

What achievements are considered when promotions and salary increases are due? (admin. & fac.)

What other kinds of rewards (i.e., other than promotion and salary increases) do faculty members receive in this college? (admin. & fac.)

How do faculty members have a part in determining the direction of the college? (admin. & fac.)

When a faculty member feels that he has a worthwhile idea or suggestion for improving the college, what can he do about it? (admin. & fac.)

What procedures are followed to help faculty members achieve their own career aspirations? To promote their professional development? (admin.)

What do you hope to be doing ten years from now? How is the college helping you achieve this aim? Helping promote your professional growth? (fac.)

How does the college provide for faculty interest in research? In teaching? In civic leadership? In student counseling? In administration? (fac. & admin.)

What are the things being done by your institution that you consider absolutely essential to faculty development? (fac. & admin.)

What things do you consider essential that are not now being done? (fac. & admin.)

Who are the persons in this institution who give you the greatest stimulation and challenge? Students, associates in the same field, other colleagues, president, dean, department heads? (fac.)

Would faculty members welcome visitors to their classes? (admin.)

Would you welcome visitors to your class? (fac.)

Exhibit C-6

List of Colleges Providing Detailed Information about Practices—Detailed Questionnaire Sample

Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia
Albany State College, Albany, Georgia
Arkansas A. & M. College, College Heights, Arkansas
Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway, Arkansas
Austin Peay State College, Clarkesville, Tennessee
Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee
Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina
Berea College, Berea, Kentucky
Bethany College, Bethany, Virginia
Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee
Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia
East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, Texas
Elon College, Elon College, North Carolina
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Georgia
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas
Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas
Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas
Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Texas
Judson College, Marion, Alabama
King College, Bristol, Virginia
Le Moyne College, Memphis, Tennessee
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Virginia
Mercer University, Macon, Georgia
Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina
Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma
Oklahoma College for Women, Chicasha, Oklahoma
Shorter College, Rome, Georgia
Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma
Stetson University, DeLand, Florida
Tift College, Forsyth, Georgia
Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky
Union University, Jackson, Tennessee
University of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas
University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee
Wiley College, Marshall, Texas
William Carey College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Exhibit C-7

Characteristics of Depth Questionnaires

The following items serve to illustrate the type of information sought from the institution in the depth questionnaire:*

1. Information requested on *orientation sessions* for all new faculty. Please answer these questions about your sessions held this past fall.
   - A. How many sessions?
   - B. Did you have a prepared agenda for your sessions?
   - C. Who decided which topics would be discussed?
   - D. Of all the topics under discussion which do you feel were the most beneficial to the new faculty?
   - E. In addition to the new faculty members, who participated in these sessions?
2. Information requested on your *pre-college workshop* for all faculty members this past fall:
   - A. What name is given to this activity on your campus?
   - B. Who plans the program?
   - C. Do you have a published program?
   - D. Approximately how many hours are given to this activity on your campus?
   - E. What topics were discussed last fall?
   - F. Which of these topics do you feel were most beneficial to the majority of the faculty?

---

*Each of the institutions listed in C-6 was sent a questionnaire calling for relatively detailed information about certain practices which the institution had reported in response to the general questionnaire, with the following cover statement:

> In your returned questionnaire you indicated that certain practices and instruments had proved to be of value for faculty development in your institution. We wish to receive the information requested on the following forms if we may have this further cooperation in the matter.